PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1956

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island
FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota
JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts
JAMES C. MURRAY, Illinois
DON MAGNUSON, Washington [1]
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa
JOHN PHILLIPS, California
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey
JOHN TABER, New York

CARSON CULP, *Staff Assistant to the Subcommittee*

[1] Temporarily assigned.

WESTERN SECTION

PART 2

Testimony of Members of Congress, Interested Organizations, and Individuals

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1956

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island
FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota
JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts
JAMES C. MURRAY, Illinois
DON MAGNUSON, Washington [1]
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa
JOHN PHILLIPS, California
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey
JOHN TABER, New York

CARSON CULP, *Staff Assistant to the Subcommittee*

[1] Temporarily assigned.

WESTERN SECTION

PART 2

Testimony of Members of Congress, Interested Organizations, and Individuals

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
61653 WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri, *Chairman*

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas
HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California
ALBERT THOMAS, Texas
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
W. F. NORRELL, Arkansas
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
J. VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia
JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico
PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR., Georgia
OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana
LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
FRED MARSHALL, Minnesota
JOHN J. RILEY, South Carolina
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, New Jersey
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee
HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia
CHARLES B. DEANE, North Carolina
JOHN F. SHELLEY, California
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts
DON MAGNUSON, Washington
WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Kentucky
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
WINFIELD K. DENTON, Indiana
JAMES C. MURRAY, Illinois

JOHN TABER, New York
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Massachusetts
BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa
H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota
WALT HORAN, Washington
GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey
IVOR D. FENTON, Pennsylvania
JOHN PHILLIPS, California
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, Kansas
FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., New York
CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio
EARL WILSON, Indiana
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
BENJAMIN F. JAMES, Pennsylvania
GERALD R. FORD, JR., Michigan
EDWARD T. MILLER, Maryland
CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois
T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, New York
FRANK T. BOW, Ohio

GEORGE Y. HARVEY, *Staff Director*
KENNETH SPRANELE, *Assistant Staff Director*

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1956

SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR WESTERN SECTION

JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee, Chairman

JOHN E. FOGARTY, Rhode Island **BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa**
JAMES C. MURRAY, Illinois **T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey**

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

TRINITY RIVER PROJECT

WITNESS

HON. CLAIR ENGLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. The western section of the Subcommittee on the Appropriations for Public Works will hear this morning Members of Congress who are interested in projects in their districts or affecting their States.

The committee is most interested to hear Hon. Clair Engle, of California, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House, a very distinguished chairman and very able member. The committee will be most pleased to hear his testimony.

Mr. ENGLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am here today in support of the recommended appropriations for the Central Valley project which is located in my State and which is, I believe, the greatest irrigation and reclamation project in the world. More particularly this morning I want to deal with the Trinity River project in California, a part of the Central Valley project, and to urge that the Trinity River project be put on construction status, which can be done without increasing the total amount of money budgeted for the Central Valley project in the current budget submitted by the Interior Department to the Congress. The 1956 budget recommendation for the Central Valley includes $400,000 for advanced planning for the Trinity River project.

This, I might add, is in addition to some $572,000 that has been spent in previous years for the same purpose. This amount can be shifted to a construction item and there is sufficient slack in the moneys appropriated for distribution systems in the Central Valley project, as well as some other features that will not be immediately needed, to permit an increase of construction funds for the Trinity River project to the extent of $1 million.

The insertion of the following statement, either in the bill or, in my opinion, in the report, would permit the start of construction of the Trinity project without increasing the funds to be appropriated. The language is as follows:

Provided, That not to exceed $1 million of the amount appropriated herein for the Central Valley project under construction rehabilitation and for the Trinity

River diversion under general investigations may be made available to initiate construction of the Trinity River diversion.

Two years ago a construction item was included in the Interior Department budget for the Trinity River project. That was stricken out by the Appropriations Committee at that time and transferred to a planning item. The reason given was that the Trinity River project was authorized under the 1939 Reclamation Act by secretarial finding of feasibility filed by Secretary of Interior Chapman on January 2, 1953, and the Appropriations Committee at that time said that it did not intend to appropriate money for construction for the Trinity River project in the absence of an explicit congressional authorization. I want to deal with that briefly.

The Reclamation Act of 1939, section 9 (a), provides that when a project meets certain rigid standards of feasibility that the Secretary of the Interior, by filing a report with Congress stating that the project meets those rigid standards of feasibility and complies in all particulars with that law, authorizes the project. In short, the authorization does not proceed from the action of the Secretary of the Interior, but rather from the operation of the law, the Reclamation Act of 1939, specifically setting up the standards. Those standards are very rigid. This is the only project in the United States left, with one exception, that I know of that will qualify under those rigid requirements.

As a matter of fact, from time to time the Congress has proceeded to build projects authorized by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of that act.

Mr. EVINS. May I interrupt you at this Point?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Could you, without difficulty, supply the committee with the names of several projects that have been initiated and constructed under this feasibility interpretation of the statute?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes, I will supply you with all of them.

(The names referred to follow:)

Name of project:	*Estimated cost*
Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada	$120, 000, 000
Palisades project, Idaho-Wyoming	24, 000, 000
San Luis Valley project, Colorado	17, 000, 000
Cachuma project, California	32, 000, 000
Solano project, California	49, 000, 000
Deer Creek powerplant, Provo River project	1, 500, 000
Additional generating capacity, Grand Coulee Dam	32, 000, 000

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert in the record at this point the appropriation section of the 1939 act, which is section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Act of 1939.

Mr. EVINS. Is that very lengthy?

Mr. ENGLE. No. It is a small, short paragraph. I have it right here.

Mr. EVINS. Read it for the record.

Mr. ENGLE. Section 9 (a) of the 1939 act reads, in part, as follows; that is the Reclamation Project Act of 1939:

If the proposed construction is found by the Secretary to have engineering feasibility, and if the repayable and returnable allocations to irrigation, power, and municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes found by the Secretary to be proper together with any allocation to flood control or navigation under subsection (b) of this section equal the total estimated cost of construction as determined by the Secretary, then the new project, new division of a project, or supplemental work on a project covered by his findings shall be deemed authorized and may be undertaken by the Secretary.

When the Secretary makes his finding, that means that this project has to pay out in 40 years plus a 10-year development period under the existing provisions of the reclamation law, and there just are not any others around able to do it, other than the one to which I refer.

Mr. EVINS. And under that section you state that there have been many projects initiated and constructed?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. I will read them to you: Davis Dam project in Arizona-Nevada, costing $120 million; the Palisade project in Idaho-Wyoming, $24 million, currently being finished I believe this year with an item in your budget; the San Luis project in Colorado, $17 million; the Cachuma project in California, $32 million; the Solano project, California, $49 million; the Deer Creek powerplant, Provo River project, $1,500,000; and in addition, additional generating capacity was added at Grand Coulee Dam under this provision in the amount of $32 million. The total construction made or in progress under that section of the reclamation law is $275 million.

For instance, I have a release here from the Department of the Interior dated April 22, 1955, referring to Federal construction of the Deer Creek, Utah, hydroelectric plant, which is one of those that I mentioned—the Deer Creek powerplant of the Provo River project.

The Secretary of the Interior issued a press release on April 22, 1955, in which he states that they are proceeding to build that project under the secretarial authorization.

In addition, this current budget has in its a substantial sum of money—it is either $5 million or $7 million—for the so-called Solano project in California, sometimes called the Monticello. When the Interior Department put the Trinity in for construction 2 years ago and the Appropriations Committee threw up its hands and said they were not going to let that item stand but they would transfer it to advanced planning, the Solano project was also in the same position, but the Solano project went ahead anyway and was put on construction status and is now vigorously under construction.

However, I want to proceed with this to say that the Secretary of the Interior made this finding January 2, 1953. During the last session of Congress, the present Interior Department had not filed a report on the Trinity project, but Secretary McKay on February 17, 1955, just this winter, approved the Trinity River project and recommended its construction in a supplemental report.

Then Commissioner of Reclamation Dexheimer, in his testimony before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on April 13, 1955, just this month, recommended immediate commencement of construction of the Trinity River project, asserting that construction of the main dam would require approximately 5 years, and because of our water shortage out there urged that we get going on the project immediately.

The State engineer of the State of California has approved the Trinity River project in his statement filed April 9, 1953. Gov. Goodwin Knight, of California, on April 14, 1955, wired the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reaffirming the State's official position in support of immediate construction of the Trinity River project. And in addition to that, this project is sponsored on the Senate side by Senator Knowland and Senator Kuchel.

As I stated before, there has been spent $572,000 by the Bureau of Reclamation in planning and preliminary engineering on the construction of this project. The Trinity project is immediately needed in California because the Central Valley canals which are presently under construction depend upon the Trinity River division for a portion of the firm water supply. In addition, there is a desperate need for additional water in the San Joaquin Valley where 500,000 acres are going out of production in the next 5 years unless supplemental supplies of water are made available.

Since construction will require a minimum of 5 or 6 years, it is imperative that this project proceed immediately.

Mr. Chairman, my statement contains also a short history of the Trinity River development, and I will ask unanimous consent to extend that with my remarks in the record. It is more or less historical and relates to the planning of this project which has gone on over a period of 30 years.

Mr. EVINS. It may be included in the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

HISTORY OF THE TRINITY RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The Trinity River division is an addition to the Central Valley project which would divert approximately 700,000 acre-feet of water annually from the Trinity River into the Central Valley of California. The diversion of this amount would provide about 1,200,000 acre-feet of water for additional use in the Central Valley. By conveying the water through a series of powerplants, over a billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy would be generated annually through the installation of 233,000 kilowatts. There is an immediate need for all this energy to meet the ever-expanding demands in northern California.

Since 1923 the Trinity development has been studied by various agencies including the State of California and the Federal Power Commission. It was included in the State water plan in 1931. In 1942 the Bureau of Reclamation started intensive studies looking toward authorization and construction of the Trinity River development. The feasibility report was completed in 1951. The report and findings by the Secretary of the Interior on the Trinity River division were transmitted to the Congress on January 2, 1953. To date $572,000 have been spent on investigations (including estimated expenditures between now and July 1). Of this amount $140,000 has been spent subsequent to authorization. This has permitted detailed studies including geologic investigations of the dam sites and the initiation of final designs.

The detailed studies subsequent to authorization have resulted in some modification in the plan, the principal change being a recommended increase in the capacity of the Trinity Reservoir. A supplementary report dated July 1954 setting out the modifications recommended in the plan has been completed, is presently under review by the State of California, and will be furnished the Congress in the very near future. However, the modifications in the authorized plan are such as to make it unnecessary to delay the appropriation of funds to undertake construction until there has been final approval of the changes.

Mr. ENGLE. This project is ready to go and it has been ready to go since January of 1953. It was included by the Interior Department itself in 1953 on a construction item basis. It has been approved now by the Secretary of the Interior in a formal supplementary report, the date of which is February 17, 1955. It has been approved and urged by the State engineer of California, by the Governor of California, and by our two United States Senators. In short, it is approved by everybody.

As far as starting construction on it and putting it on construction status at this time, it establishes no precedent whatever because, as I indicated, there are 7 or 8 projects totaling nearly $300 million which have been similarly started, and as far as I am aware, with one excep-

tion, which is the Ventura project in California, this is the only project left in the United States which will qualify for authorization under section 9 (a) of the 1939 reclamation law.

It is a project which has what we call a benefit to cost ratio which is very good. The benefit to cost ratio is 3.31 to 1. In other words, nearly $3.50 comes back for every dollar invested by the Federal Government. There is not another major water and power project in the United States which can compare with it. It is the best and the only one left, and I hope for that reason that these items will be shifted into construction status, which I say can be done without adding a dime to the total amount of money requested in this budget for the Central Valley project, because those items can be reshuffled. There is some money left in the distribution systems because of delays in getting them started—more than enough there, and several other places in this item. to permit this construction to start this year.

I am sure if inquiry is directed to the Interior Department witnesses, they will inform this subcommittee, because I have talked to some of them about it, that the money is available in this budget to put this project on construction status, increasing the amount $600,000 within the items budgeted to the Central Valley project, and I hope that this committee will see fit to do it.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Engle, for a very fine and very forceful statement. It will be most helpful to the committee. You indicated earlier that you only wanted funds diverted from the planning stage to construction. That is the principal thing that you are advocating at this time?

Mr. ENGLE. That is right, a reallocation of funds within the basic items, and within the budgeted amount.

Mr. EVINS. Without any increase in appropriations?

Mr. ENGLE. That is right, and it can be done. This language I have suggested merely directs that the funds appropriated in this budget for the Central Valley project be reshuffled to put the $400,000 set up in the budget for planning in a construction item and adding $600,000 out of other funds made available to the Central Valley project.

Mr. EVINS. I believe you pointed out very forcibly and very effectively that under this statute many projects have gone forward similar to the one here originally initiated?

Mr. ENGLE. That is right, almost $300 million worth.

Mr. EVINS. I believe you also pointed out the attitude of the present Secretary of Interior and also the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation and said that both of them favor construction of the project at this time.

Mr. ENGLE. And so testified before our committee the other day. Because of the difficulties I have had, I have introduced a bill which just says that this project is reauthorized—Governor Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, came up before our committee, and I asked him if he did not regard this project, and if this project was not carried on his books as an authorized project, and he said that it was.

Mr. EVINS. Will you state again how much has already been spent on this project in planning and general investigations to date?

Mr. ENGLE. They have spent $572,000 in advanced planning and preliminary engineering on the construction of the project. In other

words, over a half million dollars; with this $400,000 would make it nearly $1 million. When you get into the question of where you end advanced planning and begin preconstruction, it gets to be a pretty fine line. The difference, so far as I am concerned, with reference to this project is that if this project is put on construction status, from there on we know that we are on the way as far as building the project is concerned.

Mr. EVINS. The previous Secretary of the Interior, the present Secretary of the Interior, the present chief official of the Bureau of Reclamation——

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Dexheimer, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the present Governor of California, and both United States Senators.

Mr. EVINS. And certainly it is the attitude of the gentleman from California, Mr. Engle, and we thank you for your fine statement.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a pleasure to be here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAND. I would like to hear briefly about the statements you made about 500,000 acres threatening to go out of production.

Mr. ENGLE. In the San Joaquin Valley, yes. The area immediately west of Fresno has about 500,000 acres and at the present time their wells are going down to around 2,000 feet. Some of those wells cost as high as $63,000. They have proposed a project to take care of that, or to try to take care of it, called the San Luis project, which is currently sponsored by me and by Senator Kuchel and Senator Knowland. The Trinity River project would make available a little water to help them out until these other major developments can take place.

Mr. HAND. Then this project is not directly or immediately connected with the 500,000 acres of which you speak?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes; it is. The Delta Mendota Canal runs down into the area, and some 300,000 acre-feet of water can be made available from the Trinity to help that situation out down in the San Joaquin.

Mr. HAND. You contemplate that as being temporary help?

Mr. ENGLE. That is right, because eventually they will need about 2 million acre-feet of water to take care of their ultimate needs. This is merely a temporary expedient to sort of bridge the gap. This is a serious matter. There is an area down there that is 100 miles long and 50 miles wide and as flat as this table. It is beautiful land, but it is going out of production.

It used to be if some fellow spent $65,000 for a ranch, I thought he had done pretty well. They spend that much for one pump down there, digging down and trying to keep the water coming. By the way, in connection with that, perhaps I should read you the telegram that Governor Knight sent our committee while this matter was under consideration. Here is what he said in his message to the legislature on January 3, 1955, his inaugural speech:

> The Trinity River project is now being planned by the Federal Government. California has informed the Secretary of the Interior that the project is feasible from an economic and engineering standpoint and should be constructed at the earliest possible date. I recommend that this session of the legislature approve a joint resolution urging Congress to begin consideration of this construction project at the earliest possible date.

Then while we were holding hearings the other day he sent in a telegram, and this is what he said, dated April 14:

Seasonal water supply surveys just completed in California make it even more apparent that immediate authorization and construction of the Trinity River-San Luis Reservoir projects are required to forestall increasing economic losses due to water shortage. Your furtherance of hearings on pending Trinity River-San Luis Reservoir legislation is of State and national significance. More than half of the members of the California State Senate today authorized a resolution memoralizing Congress to authorize these vitally needed water projects.

Please express my appreciation as Governor to all members of your committee for the attentive consideration they have given California's pressing water needs. Cordially.

Signed, "Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California."

Mr. HAND. Was the joint resolution requested by the Governor passed?

Mr. ENGLE. That is what he referred to here in his telegram.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Engle.

Mr. ENGLE. Thank you, gentlemen.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

COLUMBIA RIVER PROJECT

WITNESS

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Mack, our colleague from Washington, is the next witness scheduled. Mr. Mack, we are always pleased to see you and welcome you, and the committee will be delighted to hear you. I believe you are interested in the Columbia River projects that are in the budget and the Chehalis River.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in that.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Mack is a very diligent, very able, very hard working, and very fine Congressman, and I want to put that in the record.

Mr. MACK. I am interested in the Columbia River. There is a project there for about $8 million, and I do intend to appear before the committee later when a supplemental appropriation bill is proposed later in the year to request an initial start on that project. Today, however, I would like to discuss with you a project on Grays Harbor, Wash., which is of emergency character.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your courtesy and kindness in providing me time today to testify on a subject of great interest to 60,000 of my constituents.

Grays Harbor is a large seaport that penetrates the center line of the Washington State coast and is navigable for big vessels, inland for about 20 miles. Ships of the Victory and Liberty class navigate the Grays Harbor channel.

Principal products exported are lumber, plywood, doors, furniture, pulp and paper. Principal products imported are oils, sulfur and lime rock for pulp mills. Several hundred large vessels clear this harbor annually with cargoes.

During 1954, a total of 171 ships loaded or unloaded 470,426 tons of cargo at Grays Harbor. Of these 171 ships, 141 had a draft in excess of 20 feet.

Grays Harbor in 1954 shipped a total of 142,115,610 feet of lumber, or 21 percent of all the cargo shipments of lumber made by the State of Washington.

The port of Grays Harbor, a local publicly owned operation, last year spent $152,800 of its own money dredging the harbor channel to keep it maintained properly.

The upper 3 to 3½ miles of the channel require dredging to a width of 200 to 350 feet and a depth of 30 feet to permit its navigation with full cargoes by the large ships that service the industries on this part of the channel.

Last year Congress authorized this dredging job on the basis of industries already located on this stretch of the river. These industries include five lumber mills and a large oil tanker unloading and storage depot.

At the hearings which preceded the authorization of this project, the United States Army Engineers testified that the dredging of this 3½-mile stretch of the river to the desired width and 30-foot depth would cost $403,400 and involve an annual maintenance cost of $12,500.

The United States Army Engineers testified that savings that would result from this $403,400 project are estimated at $33,250 annually, of which $16,380 would be from elimination of delays to shipping, $9,870 from savings in transportation, $5,000 from eliminating damage to ships and $2,000 from eliminating damage to shore installations. When a pulp mill is built on this stretch of the river these savings, of course, will be increased—probably by as much as 100 percent.

The engineers, the budget and the Public Works Committees and the Congress, last year, all agreed that, on the basis of already existing cargo users on this section of the river, this dredging job was justified. It was authorized.

Budget, however, did not include the job in the current President's budget you now are considering.

A new circumstance has developed since that budget was made up. The Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., within the last 6 weeks, decided to build a large 300-ton-a-day pulp mill at a location on the upper reaches of the proposed dredging job. This one new pulp mill, not foreseen when the budget was sent to Congress, will require 30 large ships to service it with incoming and outgoing cargo.

Unless a channel to handle incoming and outgoing freight to this mill is provided the pulp mill may not be built at this location. It is important that this channel be dredged. There now is twice as much justification for its dredging now as when the project was approved last year.

I am quite certain the United States Army Engineers will tell you so if you ask them.

The pulp mill people under Government regulations cannot dredge this river themselves even if they wanted to do so. They should not be expected to do so because five lumber mill operations and an oil tanker station also would benefit from this improvement already authorized by Congress.

There is another very important reason why the Federal Government should provide funds now to dredge this channel in order to assure the location of this pulp mill in this area.

Adjacent to Grays Harbor, and within 40 miles of the proposed location of this proposed pulp mill, the Federal Government owns 15 to 20 billion feet of standing timber that has been placed in a Federal sustained-yield unit under rules which provide that the logs from this unit must undergo primary manufacture on Grays Harbor.

The federally owned timber in this one forest Federal sustained-yield unit that is entirely owned by the Federal Government has a value on the stump, as it now stands, of not less than $150 million.

Under the sustained yield law only one-eightieth to one-hundredth of this timber is cut annually. Last year the Federal Government received $1,688,904 for the 111,045,000 board feet of logs taken from this unit. It is to be expected that the Federal Government will receive this much or more every year for the next 100 years, or longer, from this timber.

The lower grade logs that come from this sustained yield tract under normal marketing will be sold to pulp and paper mills. These logs will go to pulp and paper mills because these logs are not of a type usually desired by lumber mills or plywood plants.

Because the Government owns so much timber in the area immediately adjacent to Grays Harbor it is important it have a user of its low grade logs established in this area. By getting a pulp mill in the area better use of the Federal forests in the area will be assured. The Government will have a better market for its low grade logs and as a result probably get back over a few years many times what this proposed dredging job will cost.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Mack, for a very fine statement. How many miles of dredging do you feel would be necessary or required once the project is underway?

Mr. MACK. The harbor from the entrance to 16 miles or 16½ miles inland is dredged to a 30-foot or better depth now. There is only 3½ miles of the river on which are located 6 sawmills, 1 oil tank station, and will be this proposed pulp mill, that it will be necessary to dredge.

Mr. EVINS. Only 3½ miles?

Mr. MACK. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. What do the Corps of Engineers estimate again will be the ultimate cost?

Mr. MACK. $403,400.

Mr. EVINS. The Corps of Engineers and the Department of Interior all look favorably upon this project?

Mr. MACK. They all approved the authorization of the project last year, but it was not included, as I said, in the budget this year, for appropriation. In January no one knew about the plan to build a pulp mill at Cosmopolis. These plans have developed within the last 6 weeks.

Mr. EVINS. How much are you requesting at this time, Mr. Mack?

Mr. MACK. These pulp mill people will start building their plant by July. They will have it completed by next spring or next July 1956 so with only $403,000 required, I think the whole amount should be made available for use immediately, that is, by next July 1.

Mr. EVINS. How long has the project been studied or been considered?

Mr. MACK. It was taken up before the House Public Works Committee first, before the House of Representatives, last year and approved by the Public Works Committee; then went through the same action in the Senate. The project was authorized only last year. We would not be here pressing this matter if it were not for this new proposed pulp mill installation on the river. This pulp mill will produce 300 tons of pulp a day, 100,000 tons a year.

Mr. EVINS. The benefits to private individuals as well as to the Government from the sale of the timber will far exceed the cost of the project?

Mr. MACK. This pulp mill will make possible greater utilization of both federally owned and private timber, because pulp mills uses a low-grade log, which is always the most difficult timber for which to find a market.

Mr. EVINS. Certainly it is false economy and not farsighted not to go forward with such a project.

Mr. MACK. Under this new development, I think that is true.

Mr. HAND. Will any of this timber be lost and not go to the market if the dredging is not undertaken?

Mr. MACK. Of course, the timber eventually is going to be used. I would say that perhaps some of the low-grade logs might not reach the market because when you take a very low-grade log, you cannot transport it to a pulp mill hundreds of miles away at an economic cost. I am sure the Federal Government will obtain a better price for its adjacent pulp timber if this mill is built there.

Mr. HAND. What is the normal draft of the boats?

Mr. MACK. They use the Victory and the Liberty type or vessels, which I suppose have a draft of about 28 feet. There have been a great many groundings of ships in this area—in this section of the river which we want dredged.

Mr. HAND. Does Weyerhaeuser plan to use the 28-foot-draft ship?

Mr. MACK. I would say it would be uneconomic to use a ship of any shallower draft than 28 feet. I think Weyerhaeuser will use the Victory and Liberty type of ship. That is the type of ship that is used by Ranier Mill which is located about 5 miles downstream from the proposed Weyerhaeuser plant.

Mr. HAND. They are building this plant there with a depth of, what was it, 23 or 24 feet?

Mr. MACK. That is what it is now.

Mr. HAND. What type of ships would they plan to use if this improvement were not made?

Mr. MACK. I do not know. Weyerhaeuser has not made any statement on that. They are hopeful that the project will be built. I am satisfied if this project is not built this year it will be next year, but I think it is rather an emergency situation and the dredging should be done now because of the high ratio of benefits to cost.

Mr. HAND. Does the Weyerhaeuser plant use the harbor now?

Mr. MACK. They can use it with partly loaded ships. They could not load full cargoes unless the channel is dredged deeper than 24 feet. The mills that are located along this stretch of river today only partially load the ships with lumber.

Mr. HAND. Is there any other industry which would be directly benefited by the improvement except the new pulp mill?

Mr. MACK. Yes; there are 6 plants on that section of the river now: Shaffer Bros., E. C. Miller, the Bay City, all large saw mills employing 200 or 400 people, and there are 3 mills that employ about a hundred each, and there is the large Standard Oil tanker unloading depot. All these will benefit from this dredging, because all seven are operating on this section of the river now. They use smaller-draft vessels, and the engineers, in their testimony on this project, pointed out that by spending $403,000 on this dredging that $33,000 a year would be the annual benefits.

Mr. HAND. Is that where the engineers get the $33,000, the benefits directly resulting from the larger ships to be used?

Mr. MACK. Mainly, yes, sir; and the saving of damage to ships that will be avoided by a wider and deeper channel.

Mr. HAND. Has there been any suggestion at any time made in connection with local cooperation?

Mr. MACK. The port of Grays Harbor at the present time does dredge along harbor wharves sections of the channel. Last year the port of Grays Harbor, through a 2-mill tax, spent $152,000 for dredging on that harbor to keep commerce moving. The local authorities say that is as far as they can possibly go.

Mr. HAND. Do we not have a somewhat analogous problem in the proposed deepening of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton, at a very much larger cost of course than this project, in which the administration has suggested that the United States Steel, being largely benefited by it, pay a substantial part of the cost? It is somewhat similar, is it not?

Mr. MACK. My understanding of the Delaware River project is that as of the present time United States Steel will be practically the sole beneficiary of that improvement. It is hoped there will be other installations later on this Chehalis River project. There are 7 industrial installations already there which will immediately benefit.

We discussed in the Public Works hearing at considerable length whether the Port of Grays Harbor should be required to cooperate financially on this project, and the unanimous decision of the committee members was that they felt the Federal Government should assume the responsibility for the entire $403,000.

Mr. HAND. Did you have any special maintenance problems there in the past?

Mr. MACK. In that particular area?

Mr. HAND. Through the harbor area?

Mr. MACK. No. A number of years ago the Federal Government spent about $12 million building 2 jetties at the harbor entrance. I had a letter from General Itschner this morning telling me that ever since those jetties were completed, there always has been 30 feet of water at all points over the bar and in the channel up to about the 16-mile point.

Mr. HAND. No special dredging problems?

Mr. MACK. Except the dredging along the wharves and dredging into these two tributary smaller rivers that feed in the harbor. This dredging has been done by the port of Grays Harbor at a cost of $152,000 to the port during the last year.

Mr. HAND. What is the width of the channel at the point which you hope will be dredged?

Mr. MACK. The Engineers want to dredge the channel from 200 feet to 300 feet in width with the turning basin in the neighborhood of this Cosmopolis location so the ships can turn around and come back.

Mr. HAND. Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. You make a very persuasive argument.

Thank you very much, Mr. Mack.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY PROJECT

WITNESSESSES

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

S. WESLEY BREAK, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIF.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear Congressman Sheppard and Mr. Break. I believe Congressman Sheppard is interested in the San Bernardino County project. He is a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations and a very able and outstanding Member of Congress, and certainly this subcommittee is most pleased to hear him.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to present maps to you gentlemen of the committee. Perhaps it will be a little more interesting to have them before you, because it will give you a visual picture of the problem with which we are confronted out there. We are also supplying you with some brochures. I know what it is myself to sit in committee hearings of this character and have people come in and take up sometimes superfluously a lot of time of the committee, so I requested my people out there from an engineering and technical point of view to provide every possible answer in a brochure.

I wish to express my appreciation for the courtesy you gentlemen have conferred upon Mr. Break, chairman of the board of supervisors, San Bernardino County, Calif., and me, in permitting us to appear before your committee.

The major and north portion of the city of San Bernardino, Calif., is in a hazardous situation due to a devastated watershed.

The Devil Creek diversion together with the Lytle Creek levees lie below extensive and very recently burned areas. The estimated Federal cost of the construction concerned is $5 million. The Corps of Engineers estimates it would cost $230,000 to complete all necessary advance planning for these units; and providing no unforeseen difficulties arise, it could initiate construction in the first year funds available—expending $770,000 for construction in the first year. The total then which it could expend on this important work would be $1 million in the first year funds are made available.

On the east side of the area there is authorized a second portion of the project termed the East Twin and Warm Creeks channel improvement. The estimated cost of this second section to the Federal Government is $10,200,000. Here the Corps of Engineers could complete the advance planning amounting to $200,000 in the first year funds are available, but it would be unable to undertake the construction during the first year.

There is no recent reevaluation of the ratio of benefits to cost in this project. The ratio at time of authorization was 1.17 to 1 for the overall project. It would appear to me that the recent burns would have a marked tendency to increase this favorable ratio.

It is of the greatest importance that this project proceed at the most rapid rate possible. I recommend that the committee give consideration to appropriating the funds the Corps of Engineers believes it could use in the first year of planning and construction, totaling $1,200,000. I appreciate that this committee is faced with many, many urgent problems and many demands. Should it find it cannot appropriate the full sum, at least the $230,000 should be made available in fiscal year 1956 so the project can be constructed as soon thereafter as possible.

Mr. Break is here and prepared to give a more extensive statement than I, but I call your specific attention, if I may, to the map which you have before you, because it delineates the entire picture perhaps to much better advantage than I could explain it to you. You have a total property value involved in this situation of $953,178,700, and the total burned area, as indicated on this map, within the red lines, is 12,480 acres. The estimated population exposed is 135,000.

I call your attention, many of you perhaps were not here at the time, to what occurred in that area in 1938. We had a devastating flood that really tore the city of Colton wide open and had Army engineers out at 3 o'clock in the morning. In fact, the governmental agencies were most cooperative in trying to get that straightened out at that time to the best of their ability without adequate flood control measures.

I call your attention to the large exposed open gray section reflected in the lower left side there, where that problem hit us in 1938. That has been corrected to a reasonable degree by a large runoff area. Our problem is not centered in that particular area at the moment. The areas that are actually threatened are the city of San Bernardino and Colton and the Norton Air Force Base. The latter is a large air materiel command operation that has a total investment there of some $440 million, aside of course from the people involved who work in the depot. The amount employed there at this time is around 8,400 or possibly more. It is a very important operation within the Air Force. The entire situation has struck us by these vast burns which are depicted at the top of this photograph; that is the reason it was not in the original budget.

The project is concurred in by the Army engineers who, I presume, have made or will make a statement before your committee relative to the necessity of taking care of the situation. This is all due, very frankly, gentlemen, to the emergency developing from the recent burns we have had in this area. In other words, that watershed is just devastated and we are in a very precarious situation because, climatically speaking, we are back in the so-called wet cycle in California. It has been a dry cycle for a good many years out there, and now we are in the wet cycle. If we get a heavy precipitation in this area, we are just going to have a very serious economic problem on our hands because the entire north portion of the city of San Bernardino and adjacent territories lying thereunder are going to be involved. There is no question about it.

If you have any questions you wish to direct to me personally, I will be glad to respond. Otherwise, I will present Mr. Break, the chairman of our board of supervisors, who wishes to make a statement.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Sheppard, we may want to ask you some questions later, but we will have Mr. Break now supplement your statement.

Mr. BREAK. Gentlemen, I might make a few statements further. We have two transcontinental railroads that go through this area, the Union Pacific and the Santa Fe Railroads, and two major State highways, one State Highway 395, and the other, 66. Also back of this so-called little mountain, if you can follow the map, there is an area between here marked "San Bernardino County project." That is in the center of this. At that point it is a local drainage problem, and we have at this time engineers hired that are designing the project to take care of the drainage of that particular area. We also have a bill in our State legislature, and I talked to our State Senator this morning who told me that it was still in committee but he felt very sure that it would be allowed, of private financing for that $1,640,000 that is shown there.

That particular project will tie into the Government project or the Army engineers project. We have been working very closely with the Army engineers from the very beginning with the engineers that we have hired so that this ties in. That diversion is the important part. The Devil Canyon diversion, according to the Army engineers' survey, is about 75 percent of the potential runoff that would flood the city of San Bernardino and surrounding area.

As these maps are marked, you notice that one of them is in brown and the other is in red. The brown picturing in the map here would be the potential runoff of the Cable Canyon, and a fire as we had in December of this last year would go directly into the city of San Bernardino if this project was not completed. This runoff follows the Santa Fe and Union Pacific tracks right into the city, and that is the low area through there.

Also, at the time that the Latahone Creek project was perfected and built, this diversion was part of that project, or eventually a part of the project, to take care of any erosion against that bank because of diversion.

Also, if this project is not developed, the runoff from this area that goes to the east would flow into the Twin Creek project, which we feel would cause another diversion that might throw the water over into the north on the Air Force Base, as the Congressman has already stated to you, because of the debris.

I think there is one other statement that should be made. This is very steep mountainous area. It is a type of soil that moves very easily. It is not boulders and rocks as many of our mountains are, but it is soil. You will find in the pamphlets that I have with me photographs showing from our small range the amount of erosion that we get from just a small amount of water on this watershed, because you can see from the elevation of 1,500 to 6,000 feet it is almost straight up and down in the area that was burned last September.

Mr. EVINS. I notice that the San Bernardino County has a project up in the lefthand corner of $1,640,000. What is the nature of that?

Mr. BREAK. That is the local drainage that I referred to earlier, sir.

Mr. EVINS. Is there a dam built there?

Mr. BREAK. No; there is no dam. That is just supplemental drainage, and in the project there are settling basins for not only the settlement, but also for water.

Mr. EVINS. From that area across the brown section indicated on the map how far in distance is that?

Mr. BREAK. It is about 2½ miles, sir.

Mr. EVINS. Would the proposed dam to be built in that area be that long?

Mr. BREAK. It is not a dam, sir. It is just a channelization and debris basin.

Mr. EVINS. It is a diversion dam?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right. It takes the accumulated water that flows from the contour of your watershed and they accumulate in a somewhat restricted area, comparatively speaking, and as they accumulate and start to flow, this is to retard and hold them down and the excess water out of the area and divert it down with it disappearing at lower levels.

Mr. EVINS. For my information, would the water be diverted east of the city or west of the city?

Mr. BREAK. That is east of the city.

Mr. EVINS. That would tie in with the Twin Creek project?

Mr. BREAK. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. The initial cost of that phase of the project was estimated at about $5 million?

Mr. BREAK. For the Devil Canyon diversion the engineers estimated cost is around $5 million.

Mr. EVINS. Then from the area in which it connects with the Twin Creek project there is a second portion of the project. How much is the estimated cost of that?

Mr. BREAK. Around $11 million, if I remember correctly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. And the second portion has to do with strengthening or dredging and improving that drainage area?

Mr. BREAK. That is a channelization.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There would be no dredging in there. It is a matter of heavy bulldozing work for the purpose of taking your soil and moving it out to the right or left side of your channelization. There will be no dredging as such. It is all a heavy dirt moving operation.

Mr. EVINS. The property damage in the past, I judge, Congressman Sheppard, has been far greater than the estimated cost?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Oh, yes. It is, gentleman, difficult for me to recall the specific figure at the moment for 1938, but it was an extremely heavy loss, because it went right down through the center and took out houses on the left side of the map. There was one piece of center road of heavy cement that weighed, as I recall it, some three and a half tons. It was literally picked up en bloc by the crest of that water surge and carried about three quarters of a mile downstream.

In other words, what happens out there in that watershed area, when you get a heavy precipitation, is that all of this precipitation accumulation just goes out tremendously. It has to be diverted. There is no doubt in the world about it.

Mr. BREAK. In the beginning, gentlemen, you were looking at land. Today this whole area, as you can see from the photograph here, is homes. It is human lives that need to be protected now as much as land. Our population growth has been about 20,000 a year in the past 10 years.

Mr. EVINS. Did the State Highway Department make a contribution in connection with road construction?

Mr. BREAK. Yes, sir; that part and the railroad companies and the public utilities, and I have the clearance through our State water resources board, and they have gone along with this project to make monies available for utilities.

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Fogarty has previously asked questions of Colonel Berrigan and others regarding this project and extensive information has been obtained. I might ask Congressman Fogarty at this time if he has further questions.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I think it has been pretty well covered.

Mr. JENSEN. This flood-control condition is bound to get no better since you have that great burned-off area there. The water rushes down onto your lowland. Of course, this is the first time this situation has come to my attention.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Perhaps that is my own fault, and I will tell you why: Because I was pretty well tied up with my own hearings, and I have not had a chance to talk to you gentlemen about the issue.

Mr. JENSEN. I can see you have a desperate situation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If it had not been for this fire—very frankly, the project set forth by the Army engineers has been authorized for some, I think, three and a half years——

Mr. JENSEN. Since 1950.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would have undoubtedly taken care of itself to a degree, that is, with the work the county was doing in there.

Mr. JENSEN. Have the Army engineers made any statement to the effect that they were going to ask for money in the supplemental for next year?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, they would ask for money in the supplemental when they are permitted to do so. The regular budget was formulated, and this happened at a later date, and we just could not get any money in the budget at that time.

Mr. JENSEN. How much money can you spend in fiscal 1956?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The statement that I have here comes because I asked for this information from the Army engineers. They say they can handle $1,200,000, $200,000 to be expended for the completion of their planning operation, and they would have enough time left if something unforeseen did not occur to expend a million dollars in construction.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it a fact that there is not too much planning necessary?

Mr. BREAK. The preliminary work has been done, but the final planning has not. As the county has this land purchased, there is no land to be purchased in this right-of-way. It has been purchased out of flood-control funds, because this was in the early plans of the Great Canyon. At that time we started acquisition of this total right-of-way and we have that ready at this time.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not hesitate, gentlemen, to say that in a case of this kind it is pennywise and pound foolish to put off construction

of a project of this kind which we know is going to have to be done sooner or later, and the quicker we can get at it, the less it will cost. I do not make a practice of putting myself on record for a project at this stage of the game, but taking a quick look at this would indicate to me that this is a project that we should not put off. I am not going to say after I take a longer look at it that I am going to take that position. I am going to leave a little hole for myself to crawl out, because this is pretty fast judgment I am taking right now, but in looking at this photograph here of that whole valley and hearing you gentlemen testify and reading some of the engineers' reports, it does not take me long to come to the conclusion that this is a project that has to be taken hold of quickly, Mr. Chairman, in order to save money and to save people and to save property and to save the taxpayers' money.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Jensen, I think you will recall that I have been very reluctant to appear before this committee and make a presentation of the character that I am desirous of making today, because I have felt that the committees previously which had jurisdiction were handling the situation properly, that it should flow through with the other projects that were authorized. I had no objection to that. However, at that time my opinion was based upon the fact that we did not have these burns in here, and these have happened since then to the degree that if we have rainfall of any normal character, we are just in a lot of trouble. Otherwise, I am frank to tell you I would not be appearing here and asking for funds in excess of the budget.

Mr. EVINS. The $1,200,000 you are asking for is for plans and engineering and some construction?

Mr. SHEPPARD. And money they can spend this year. The other projects we are not asking for. That is a matter that can flow through in the normal channel.

Mr. BREAK. I met with the district Army engineers in the Los Angeles division and went over this with them. Also, when I was here a month ago, I was with General Itschner and went over the project with him, so the Army engineers have this thing definitely and they know all the details.

Mr. EVINS. All the difficulty has been largely with the Budget Bureau?

Mr. BREAK. That is right, sir. It has been a matter of money, and we would not be pushing so hard for this now, but here we are. We have been in a dry cycle. This is an area that can well be covered with snow. If we get a warm spring rain, then there will be a terrific runoff. There is no vegetation whatever to hold any of that soil from moving.

Mr. JENSEN. We know you are going to have a flood every year when the snow melts in the mountains, is not that right?

Mr. BREAK. That is right, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. And there is a big area of mountains that drains into that rather small area, so you cannot expect any of the floods to be any less than they have been this year since the timber was burned off. Have you asked for a budget request on this?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No. I will ask in next year's budget for the total project, but not this year.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. HAND. Has there been a history of floods in the San Bernardino Valley?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. Serious floods in this particular valley?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. When were they; recently?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The last real devastating flood we had was in 1938. You see we have been through a dry cycle, Mr. Hand, over a period of some 8 years. In fact, we are about a year and a half, under the so-called wet and dry cycles, late now with the situation with which we may be confronted. We can have a terrifically heavy flood any time.

Mr. HAND. Did the flood of 1938 affect the city of San Bernardino itself?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the lower section, yes; because the two cities are closely related, something like Minneapolis and St. Paul. If you look at the map, Mr. Hand, you will find the gray expansion in here is drawn down through Verdemont, where it says in the left section Devore-Verdemont area. That is where your flood occurred in 1938 to I would not say a full one-third of the population of San Bernardino. On the southern and western sides they were also injured, because your flood at that time had its origin further to the left than the present potential.

Mr. HAND. Especially in Colton?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mr. BREAK. The area of San Bernardino extends below that dark brown part. That is populated in there and also there are the railroad yards and all those things.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You have the large pulp and railroad yards of the Southern Pacific.

Mr. HAND. Let me get this definitely straight. Has there been any application at all to the Bureau of the Budget in connection with this project?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not in connection with this budget as yet, because we were told by the former chairman of the committee that handled it that they had allocated money for certain hazardous or semihazardous floods in year steps and they were finishing what they considered were most vital projects, and they were doing a good job. I have no criticism of this procedure. However, since that policy has been set, we have had this burn take place. If we had not had this burn, we would have been perfectly happy to go along with the course of normal engineering events. We would not be here at all.

Mr. JENSEN. How many thousand acres of land were burned off?

Mr. BREAK. 12,480 acres. It is a 10-mile strip there across the front of those mountains.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to say to you gentlemen as a whole committee, I thank you very much, and I am sure that you oldtimers whom I have served with for many years know that it is not a habit of mine to come before a committee and ask for an emergency appropriation unless the emergency actually prevails, I just will not do that.

Mr. JENSEN. We know that very well.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you; and thank you, Mr. Break. I might say that you are most persuasive.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY SURVEY

WITNESS

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear next our colleague, Congressman Miller of California. I understand he is interested in the San Francisco Bay survey project. We are very pleased to see you, Mr. Miller, and to hear your testimony.

Mr. Miller is one of our fine colleagues, a very able Congressman, very diligent, hard working, and is a strong advocate for the things he champions. We are very pleased to receive your testimony, Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to know that all of your generous statement is in the record, because I will put it to good advantage.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to plead for money for the San Francisco Bay survey. You have all of the technical data that is necessary before you to justify it.

I want to point out to you that the San Francisco Bay is one of the great landlocked harbors of the world and plays a very important part in the economy and the defense plans and efforts of this country.

Throughout recent years, for some reason—we may all have different theories about it—there have been gradual changes in the hydrography in that bay. Personally, I think it comes about by reason of the fact that when we store waters in the Sierras to be used for irrigation and power development, we change the nature of the flow of the rivers that run into the bay.

In the other days under its pristine form these great floods occurred in the spring of the year and apparently had a scouring action on the floor of the bay. In the last 20 years we have filled the tideland and built an artificial island in the center of the bay that is now part of our great naval institution. We are continuing to reclaim and fill these lands, and as a result there is an apparent change in the hydrography of San Francisco Bay and the adjacent inland waterways.

Places where there has never been silt, we now find it. Some years ago, about 1937 or 1938, when they started to build what is now known as Treasure Island, a 620-acre manmade island in north of Goat Island, the natural island in the bay, the battleship *Texas* came into harbor one day and went on down the usual course to her anchorage. She stuck in the mud. She was there for 2 weeks. The then current charts failed to show a mudbank on this route but it was there. It might have been made by a change in the current. We know that such things are taking place. To correct these conditions we have asked for and gotten money for dredging channels, and so forth.

Studies are being made out there, but before you can plan or know where you are going to go it is necessary to have an overall study made of that bay system and its hydrography so that we will know what we can do and what we cannot do, and what is going to happen if we make additional changes.

That is the object of this survey and that is why I am here pleading for the money to get it initiated. Necessity for an exhaustive study

is now recognized as highly desirable. The Army engineers make these surveys and studies. They have a great plant down near Vicksburg, Miss., where they make a map of actual canals in prototype of the thing they are studying and then by turning water into it they can study the current and flows and know just what is going to happen when they put structures in the waterway under investigation. This then is merely part of the planning for that great western bay area and I ask your consideration of it.

The things that I have told you about silting are my own conclusions, my own ideas and those that I have gleaned from engineers, because this problem is not new. Mine, however, is a layman's opinion. It may be entirely erroneous, but the engineers themselves do not know the answer and this is an effort to allow them to get some of the answers to the pertinent problems.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Miller, for your fine statement. You are supporting the budget request of $250,000 for a general survey of the entire problem in the San Francisco Bay?

Mr. MILLER. The San Francisco Bay area survey, and this request is for the first increment of it, will continue for some time. I think it is going to cost more money as you go along, but this is all the money the Corps of Engineers can efficiently expend at this time. What they will do is to reproduce the San Francisco Bay and its tributary facilities in an area north of San Francisco, and when they turn water into the reproduced model they can then determine what is going to happen under similar conditions.

Mr. EVINS. Other than the fact that the *Texas* ship got lodged in the mudbank, what other difficulties have you been experiencing?

Mr. MILLER. If you would want me to go into exhaustive detail I would burden the record. A few instances will suffice; the Government has a big naval air station, NAS, Alameda. It is at the western end of the town in which I live, where as a youngster we used to have fine swimming beaches. They are now filled with 6 feet of blue muck or mud that has been deposited on them. Every 2 years or 3 years the NAS, Alameda, has to have the basin and the channel dredged. They built a bulkhead about 2,000 feet offshore trying to stop the infiltration of silt into the basin where the carriers dock. If the Navy would let the silting go for about 5 years you couldn't get the carriers in at all. One trouble is they not only stick in the mud but they get silt into their condensers and it just raises the dickens with them.

During the war, as late as the 1940's, the area of the upper bay where they degaussed ships by running them around in circles before they put out to sea to get the electricity out of them, on account of electric mines—I think you are familiar with this—the area where we degaussed ships as late as the war has now silted to the point where it is closed to navigation of big ships. Around Richmond, Calif., you have appropriated money to desilt the channels so the tankers can dock. We have spent on an emergency basis last year about $40,000 on the Oakland Estuary.

As I say, I personally think that in the old days you had this great scouring effect of water that came from the natural melting of the mountain snow that is now held back by dams and until we know what is happening to the bay we cannot take intelligent long-range steps to correct it.

Mr. EVINS. Certainly it is your view that these studies should go forward and not be postponed?

Mr. MILLER. I think it is highly important that they go forward.

If you have been down in the Panama Canal you have seen the model of the canal that they have there to study tides and so forth, and that is just what we are asking for for the San Francisco Bay area. It is to get firsthand knowledge.

I could recite a lot of other instances, but I don't think they are necessary.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Congressman Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, gentlemen.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

THE DALLES AND OWYHEE PROJECTS

WITNESS

HON. SAM COON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. EVINS. We will hear next Congressman Sam Coon, of Oregon. I believe he is interested in the Dalles project and the Owyhee project.

Mr. Coon is a very personable and very hard-working Congressman, and the committee will be pleased to receive his statement.

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before this committee today in behalf of certain Indian families who have been or will be dispossessed in the process of constructing the Dalles Dam project on the Columbia River in the States of Washington and Oregon.

I want to urge that a sum not to exceed $200,000 be allowed for the acquisition of land and the construction, or purchase, of adequate homes for these Indian families. These homes may be constructed, or purchased, on established reservations, in existing communities, or on certain "in lieu" sites already acquired by the Department of Defense for the Warm Springs, Umatilla, and Yakima Indians.

It is my understanding from the Corps of Army Engineers that this sum, approximately $200,000, is now available in the funds already appropriated for this project, and that all that is needed is authorization by this committee for its use.

Together with my request for the authorization of the use of such funds for this purpose, I would like to call to the attention of the committee, and to make a part of my statement a letter from the Honorable Ward R. Webber, county judge of Wasco County, Oreg., under date of March 19, 1955, and the "Suggested plans and recommendations for relocating Indians who now claim legal residence in the area between Highway and Columbia River at Celilo, Oreg.," sent me by the Wasco County court, both of which I mailed to the Honorable Clarence Cannon, chairman of this committee, on March 24, 1955.

Mr. Chairman, I have another statement regarding the Owyhee Reservation project.

Mr. EVINS. Proceed.

Mr. COONS. I am appearing before this committee today in behalf of the request which the regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation

at Boise, Idaho, has made for $45,000 of emergency rehabilitation and betterment funds for the Owyhee project this fiscal year. The $45,000 made available from 1955 funds will reduce the requirement for the 1956 appropriation by this amount. The 1956 appropriation bill, which has been submitted by the Secretary and approved by the Bureau of the Budget contains the item of $45,000 for which it is now proposed to use emergency funds. It is extremely imperative that the $45,000 be made available this fiscal year to allow for purchase of replacement pumps for the Gem Irrigation District plant. The present pumps are in such condition that they could fail during the irrigation season which would be disastrous with the expected short water season.

This matter has been brought to my attention by the boards of directors of the various Oregon irrigation districts within the Owyhee project. Although the pumps in question are used by the Gem Irrigation District in Idaho, it becomes serious to the Oregon districts for the reason that all of the districts are within the Owyhee project and the Gem District, by pumping from the Snake River increases the amount of gravity water supply to the districts and should the pumps fail and the Gem District be required to share more heavily in the gravity water supply, each of the Oregon districts would be very seriously affected.

A hearing before the Army engineers held at Boise about 5 weeks ago in connection with the proposed Duncan Ferry dam site indicated clearly the desperate situation the Owyhee project is in this coming year. Between the water shortage for the area served by gravity and the fact that the area served by pumping from Snake River may be disrupted if the present pumps, which have been in use since about 1919, should fail, it is probable that many of the farmers will not grow row crops or sugar beets this year but will substitute hay or grain crops which will have a better chance of reaching maturity. This, of course, is going to substantially reduce employment in the project area and result in lower returns to the farmer.

Together with my request that the $45,000 be made available at this time, I want to call to the attention of the committee, and to make a part of my remarks, a statement which I received from Mr. W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, on March 10, 1955, in support of this request, and which I mailed to Hon. Clarence Cannon, chairman of this committee, on March 11, 1955.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Coon.

In connection with the first portion of your statement and the Dalles Dam project, there is some testimony that they have saved some money in the construction of this project from that which they had earlier estimated. Is it the plan so far as you know of the Corps of Engineers to use some of the money saved for resettling the Indians in this area?

Mr. COON. That is their plan, yes, and they are making substantial savings as they are spending less than they originally estimated, so they do have this money available now.

Mr. EVINS. That is what you are advocating, that they be permitted to use these savings or money already appropriated for purchase of land, acquiring option on lands, and for construction of homes?

Mr. COON. That is correct, in order to relocate the Indians who are going to be flooded out when the dam is constructed and the water is backed up there.

Mr. EVINS. We may have had this information earlier, but how many Indians will be required to be relocated?

Mr. COON. I would have to look it up in this other information. I do not have it right here.

Mr. EVINS. Would it be necessary to acquire land in view of the fact that you have reservations in the area?

Mr. COON. It might not be; they could relocate them on those reservations that are nearby, reservations which are already there.

Mr. EVINS. Your statement mentioned the acquisition of lands. What lands will be acquired?

Mr. COON. If the Army engineers want to relocate them on other lands, my request is that they be permitted to do so. However, there are reservations, with plenty of ground, which they already have, where they might be able to place them. The Warm Springs Reservation is nearby, and it is not too far to other reservations.

Mr. EVINS. The information you have is $200,000 will be sufficient for that entire program?

Mr. COON. Yes; an amount not to exceed $200,000. Probably it will be some less.

Mr. JENSEN. In the event this $200,000 is not allowed, then what would happen?

Mr. COON. I suspect this money would then be additional surplus which the engineers would have left from appropriated funds.

Mr. JENSEN. What effect would it have on the Indians?

Mr. COON. There will be an awfully unhappy bunch of Indians who will be left and have to move from this area at Celilo Falls there.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you feel it is a Federal obligation?

Mr. COON. The county court down there and all the people that have written me on it think that it is, and I think that it is, too.

Mr. JENSEN. You think it is clearly a Federal obligation to take care of the Indians in the manner which is presented?

Mr. COON. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. EVINS. Concerning the Owyhee project, the other portion of your statement, that is in support of the budget justification for betterment of projects, including the pumping facilities?

Mr. COON. The idea is to get it done this year rather than wait until the appropriation bill is passed. The $45,000 we are requesting for use now will then be taken out of next year's budget, but it will permit them to replace these pumps at once, pumps which have been in use since 1919, and which they doubt will last another summer.

Mr. EVINS. The Bureau of Reclamation is requesting funds in this amount for this purpose?

Mr. COON. To transfer from next year's appropriation into this year's appropriation so they can use it right away.

Mr. EVINS. Not rolling forward, but to put it in in the most speedy operation?

Mr. COON. Yes. And all it takes is an O. K. of this committee to give them a chance to go ahead and do this right away.

Mr. EVINS. It is entirely necessary in your judgment?

Mr. COON. I think it is, due to the fact that they face a very critical water shortage and, if some of these pumps go haywire this year and cannot be used, there would be an extreme water shortage there.

Mr. EVINS. We have some real water problems in your area. In some cases we do not have enough water and in other cases we have too much water.

Mr. COON. It varies with the seasons. This season we are expecting a very short supply, especially in this Owyhee River project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very kindly, Mr. Coon, for your very fine statement and for your excellent presentation of your position. You are very persuasive.

Mr. COON. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

NEVADA PROJECTS

WITNESS

HON. CLIFTON YOUNG, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Young, of Nevada, is the next witness scheduled. Mr. Young, the committee is pleased to see you and hear your testimony.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you. I would like to appear in support of several flood-control projects in Nevada, more particularly in southern Nevada.

One of the projects is really a dual project. It is located about 20 miles east of the city of Caliente, which is rather appropriately named, being Spanish for "warm". Caliente is about 120 miles northeast of Las Vegas, or to use another method of orientation, the area is about 100 miles east of where the atomic energy experimental ground is located. There are here two projects which have been authorized. One is the Pine Canyon Reservoir. The other is the Mathews Canyon Reservoir. Last year some $57,000 was appropriated for planning on the Pine Canyon Reservoir. It is my understanding that $65,000 is being sought this year for the purpose of further planning on the Mathews Canyon Reservoir. These reservoirs would collect waters which originate in the Meadow Valley region and course downward into the Virgin River and Muddy River, which empty into Lake Mead, which is, as the committee well knows, located behind Hoover Dam. There are several reasons why flood control in this area is important. First, because of the damage that has been done and could be done to the rather limited but extensive agriculture; secondly, because in that vicinity there is an important highway and perhaps even more important, there is a transcontinental railroad which is routed through that area.

In the past 44 years it is estimated there have been some $7 million worth of damage done by flood waters which, when in a water spout form, are capable of tremendous damage. At one time the railroad service was discontinued for a period of almost 6 months. It has been stopped on a number of other occasions. The ever-present threat of flood damage is a cause for concern with respect to the transportation afforded by the Union Pacific Railroad in the event of a national emergency.

I respectfully urge the committee to approve the request for $65,000 for advance planning on Mathews Canyon.

The second project for which I would like to offer testimony is a program to conduct a preliminary survey of flood-control work on the Las Vegas Wash. This, as the name would indicate, is located north of the city of Las Vegas. In 1952 Congress authorized a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes in the Las Vegas Wash. I have several pictures which show to some extent the damage which is occurring in that area. Again, there is limited water. It seems paradoxical that in an area where there is so little water there is the potential of such damage.

The city of Las Vegas is a modern boomtown that has probably expanded from 8,000 in 1940 to perhaps 65,000 or 70,000 at the present time and it is continuing to grow by leaps and bounds.

Most of the area where the water originates is Federal terrain. Indeed eighty seven and four-tenths of the State is under Federal jurisdiction. The amount which I am informed would be necessary to conduct a preliminary survey to decide whether further flood-control work should be done is only $6,000. With this sum, the Engineer Corps could conduct a preliminary investigation of that area, checking weather reports, the damage, and see whether additional Engineer Corps work would be justified.

There are a number of people who are building homes not too far from the ditch or gully that you see there and in the past some of these yards have been covered with flood water. If you went out there most times in the year, you would probably wonder where the water ever came from, but surrounding Las Vegas is a series of parched areas and mountain ranges where, when any water does come that way, there is nothing to hold it back, no foliage or grass. It courses on down into the valley and has a potential of doing a great deal of damage. So I again respectfully urge that the committee give consideration to the possibility of $6,000 to conduct a preliminary investigation.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Young, for your fine statement.

Concerning the Mathews project, you are supporting the $65,000 that is in the budget for that survey?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVINS. That was a very fine statement.

Mr. YOUNG. Thank you very much.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROJECT

WITNESS

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. We are glad to receive Mr. Hiestand of Callfornia. You may proceed.

Mr. HIESTAND. Thank you very much. I have just a brief statement, gentlemen.

Mr. EVINS. You are interested in the Los Angeles County project?

Mr. HIESTAND. Yes, sir.

I am Edgar W. Hiestand, Representative in Congress for the 21st District of California. This district includes practically the entire Angeles National Forest, which is in the San Gabriel Mountains just north of the Los Angeles plain. Since it is a national forest, the Federal Government's responsibility to prevent disaster to the surrounding communities is very clear and undisputed.

In this case, the surrounding communities have done everything that could possibly be expected to protect themselves from flood damage, and have over the years put up even more than the Federal Government, to the extent of about a dollar and a half for every dollar put up by the Federal Government.

We must realize that when great forest fires strip the mountainsides of moisture-retaining vegetation, the resulting floods the ensuing years are not only walls of water but walls of rocks and boulders, some of them as large as automobiles, and they take out buildings and lives: A total of 100 lives were lost and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of damage was caused in the great floods of 1934 and 1938, in the district I represent, alone.

A great program of flood-control work has been going on since that time and is approaching completion. The county flood control district, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, has been doing one of the outstanding jobs in the country. Certain items to complete and connect up projects already approved and installed are very vital. Among the projects started in 1955 that come in this catagory are the improving and lining of the Sawpit Wash above Monrovia, at a cost of $750,000; and the improvement of the Eaton Wash through Arcadia, at a cost of $1,425,000, and the completing of the Arcadia Wash at a cost of $1,008,000. Without these connecting washes, an overflow from the debris dams above them could be disastrous.

Very greatly needed projects to connect up existing improvements scheduled for initiation this year include: Los Angeles River from Owensmouth Avenue to Sepulveda Reservoir, $277,800; Los Angeles River, Victory Boulevard to Dayton, $991,000; and Arcadia Wash, Lima Street Branch, $442,700.

With the completion of these connections, flood hazard from the fire-denuded mountains will be largely under control, as far as the 21st district is concerned. Two other very important but lesser improvements can probably wait another year: the Burbank-Western project for $900,000 and the Rubio Canyon Debris Basin, preliminarily estimated at $450,000.

I wish respectfully to reiterate that these projects are definite Federal responsibilities, but that they also have a very large share of local participation. I shall be happy to supply documentary evidence in support of each of the statements I have made, if you so desire.

I did not bring in many charts, gentlemen, and much data on the history of the thing because I know that most of you have been told this a number of times, and you are quite familiar with it. I would be happy to answer questions, however, if any of the committee desires to ask them.

Mr. EVINS. You represent the 21st District of California?

Mr. HIESTAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVINS. Do most of these project requests affect largely this district?

Mr. HIESTAND. They affect this district, but they also affect the other land below my particular district, but they come from the mountains that are in my district. In other words, we cause the damage below us.

Mr. EVINS. You have said that other items could be deferred.

Mr. HIESTAND. Those are the last two: The Burbank-Western and Rubio Canyon debris basin. They are on the schedule for later completion. They are important, but there is a certain limit to what you can do in any given one year.

Mr. EVINS. Are all of the items for which you have given testimony included in the budget for fiscal year 1956?

Mr. HIESTAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVINS. And the amounts of funds you are requesting are the identical amounts of funds in the budget?

Mr. HIESTAND. I believe so. I only had informal statements. There may be some slight variation. It would be very slight. The committee could check the similarity. I think they are the same.

Mr. EVINS. Has this work been continued for several years, Mr. Hiestand?

Mr. HIESTAND. Yes, sir; it has. It has been continuing ever since the middle thirties.

Mr. EVINS. What is the degree of success of the work of the program?

Mr. HIESTAND. Superb. On this little map that Mr. Fogarty has are the marks of four terrific forest fires that occurred during the dry season of 1953. They threatened the cities right adjacent to the base of the mountains with complete disaster and perhaps almost annihilation. We rushed funds a year ago for debris dams in the bases of five canyons there. They were thrown up, pretty big ones, and we had a break the first winter. The highest storm we had was a 2-inch storm over 48 hours, so the mountainsides absorbed that, and now we have the dams in and they have taken all the storms this year right in their stride. If we had an extra heavy one, we would have to have runoff facilities and that is the purpose of this.

Mr. EVINS. Could you give the committee a statement in round figures as to the amount of participation by State and county?

Mr. HIESTAND. I have not the breakdown except this way: That over the years the Los Angeles County Flood Control District has put up about $80 million, and I believe that the Federal contribution is around $50 million to $55 million. That would have to be checked. The flood-control district has put up about a dollar and a half to every dollar the Federal Government has put up.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it is very clear that the items that are in the budget that the Congressman is testifying in favor of are without a doubt very worthy projects.

Mr. HIESTAND. I can only reiterate to any of you to whom this story is new that again it is a disaster threat that is very, very serious. In one storm a bunch of these rocks coming out of the canyons came down fast enough and in one building snuffed out 25 lives, a total of 65 for that storm, and many millions of dollars. That was in 1938. Prior to that in 1934 we had the same thing.

I have newspapers of that time with all the lurid pictures, but I had an idea that many of you had been on this subcommittee before and knew the hazard of the thing. Progress is being made, as is shown by this chart, and the evidence will come before you a little later in behalf of the Los Angeles committee in detail, but this is a thing, gentlemen, in which we have to play for keeps. This is not just a boondog-like job. We are facing disaster, and it is the Federal responsibility. I know you gentlemen will give it every consideration.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Hiestand, for a very clear statement. You made a very fine statement and a very persuasive statement.

Mr. HIESTAND. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

COLUMBIA RIVER

WITNESS

HON. WALT HORAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. EVINS. We are delighted to have Mr. Horan here with us and we will be pleased to hear you. You have been a very able Congressman, and the committee is delighted to have your testimony.

Mr. HORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

I am here to testify first for the Bonneville Power Administration funds.

Mr. EVINS. Your statement will be placed in the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. WALT HORAN, FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

The 1956 budget request for the Bonneville Power Administration includes $2,537,000 for the construction of substation and transmission facilities in the Fifth Congressional District of Washington. Well over one-half of this request is for the continued construction of the eastern portion of the high-voltage lines which will transmit Chief Joseph power to the Seattle area. Work is continuing on the Glenn H. Bell Substation which will eliminate hazardous operating conditions. In addition, funds are required to continue work on service to the Okanogan County PUD. It is necessary to replace the transformer at the Creston Substation with a larger one in order to meet increased load demands of the Lincoln County Electric Co-op, which is served out of this substation, along with the Washington Water Power Co. The Valley Way Substation, which serves the Inland Power & Light Co. of the Vera Irrigation District is being increased in capacity by transformer budgeted in 1955. Funds are required in 1956 for the purchase of remaining material and installation.

The above-mentioned facilities are the main ones for which funds are requested in 1956, and I respectfully request that these funds be made available.

Another portion of the budget request which is very important, not only to the Fifth Congressional District of Washington, but the entire region, is the requirement for operation and maintenance funds. The amount requested is $6,650,000. This is an increase of $563,785 over that which was appropriated last year, and the increase for direct operation and maintenance comprises approximately 95 percent of the increase. Since the Federal transmission facilities are increasing annually, it is logical that more funds are needed for the purpose of operating and maintaining them satisfactorily. I urge that careful consideration be given to this request in order that the Federal Government's investment may be adequately operated and cared for.

Fifth Congressional District of Washington—President's 1956 budget request

100.	Major grid:	
	108. Chief Joseph-Snohomish No. 3 and Chief Joseph-Covington No. 1	$1,860,000
	143. Spokane area service:	
	(*a*) Work under way	336,000
	(*b*) Bell substation additions	114,000
	148. Hot Springs-Spokane No. 1	4,000
200.	Seattle area:	
	222. Okanogan County	33,000
	299. Other transmission facilities:	
	(*a*) Work under way	5,000
	(*f*) Other new work	15,000
600.	Spokane area, upper portion:	
	621. Creston transformer replacement	15,000
	629. Valley Way substation additions	47,000
	699. Other transmission facilities	50,000
800.	General system facilities:	
	(*d*) Northeast area maintenance headquarters	15,000
	(*f*) Chief Joseph maintenance headquarters	43,000
	Total	2,537,000

Mr. HORAN. A little over $2½ million of the Bonneville Power Administration funds are in my district, and it is merely for the carrying out of the transmission system there. We are particularly anxious for the operation and maintenance amount of $6,650,000, which is an increase, but I think it is justified.

GRAND COULEE DAM

The second item, Mr. Chairman, is with regard to the floodlighting at Grand Coulee Dam, an item which will require, according to present plans, some $200,000 for its achievement. There is quite a good deal of interest in this item. I think this item would be in order if we can afford it, since it is a matter of national interest.

I have a statement that I would like to submit for the record.

Mr. EVINS. The statement will be included in the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF FLOODLIGHTING SPILLWAY, GRAND COULEE DAM, COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

A permanent system of floodlighting is proposed for installation at the Grand Coulee Dam for highlighting and dramatizing the spectacular waterfall as it cascades down the 550-foot slope of the spillway section. Floodlighting of other national features, such as Niagara Falls and the Mount Rushmore National Memorial, has proven very beneficial in improving the sites as attractions for tourists. In addition to the public-relations aspect the lighting of Grand Coulee Dam would permit better supervision of the installation at night and would be a deterrent to any mischievous or subversive activity.

It is estimated that the cost of providing a permanent lighting system to effectively illuminate the spillway section would be $200,000. Such installation would not only provide an intensity of light generally recommended for waterfalls of this character but also would penetrate clouds of spray which occur during periods of maximum discharge from the reservoir. It is proposed that funds of this amount be made available in the fiscal year 1956 estimate for the Columbia Basin project in addition to the amounts presently scheduled which are required to maintain the present program of delivery of water to additional project acreage.

Since the proposed lighting does not contribute in any way to the operation of the project or to the revenues derived therefrom, and is justified solely as a public interest measure, it is proposed that any funds provided for this purpose be declared nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. HORAN. The next item is general investigations for the Bureau of Reclamation, and I have a statement on that which I would like included in the record.

Mr. EVINS. The statement will be inserted.

(The statement referred to follows:)

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

To finance a continuation of the general investigation program during fiscal year 1956, an appropriation of $5,175,000 is being requested which with $475,000 being contributed by local groups will provide a total program of $5,650,000.

Although this request is an increase of about 36 percent compared to the funds appropriated for the current fiscal year, it is the minimum amount that the Bureau will need to maintain an adequate planning program. Prior to the current fiscal year the funds appropriated for this activity had been less than the year before for 4 successive years, and the general investigation activity which is really the "backbone" of the western reclamation program has been reduced to a dangerously low level. In fact the investigation program has been curtailed so much that projects are being constructed much faster than new ones are being planned and authorized. The Bureau of Reclamation has at the present time practically no backlog of authorized projects which it can recommend for construction and from which Congress can make selections in appropriating construction funds.

Before development of an irrigation project can proceed, a finding must be made that the potential project is a good investment. This is accomplished through a series of investigations directed toward a determination of engineering feasibility or the planning and the estimating of the costs of the physical structures, and a determination of financial feasibility. The results of these feasibility investigations are summarized in a planning report, for consideration for authorization and to serve as a basis for proceeding with construction of the project. It takes time and funds to make adequate investigations. The planning must be done now for projects that will be constructed years from now.

With the continuing pressure for irrigation development, particularly for additional water to supplement existing but inadequate supplies, there is a danger that projects may be authorized and started before adequate planning has been completed. In order to insure an adequate planning program which in turn would insure no costly false starts, the full amount of the general investigation request should be provided.

Included in the fiscal year 1956 request are $50,000 for studies of the Okanogan-Similkameen Division of the Chief Joseph Dam project and $20,000 for the Spokane Valley project.

The investigation of the Okanogan-Similkameen Division is aimed at providing a supplemental water supply for some 19,800 acres of land now irrigated as well as developing some 7,000 acres of new land. Much of the land now in cultivation consists of valuable orchards but the water supply now available is entirely inadequate in years of low river flow. Unless provision is made for additional storage, there is strong likelihood that there may be loss of orchard trees in the immediate future in addition to the crop losses now being suffered. The urgency of undertaking this investigation is also heightened by the fact that there are continuing upstream developments in Canada that are making increasing inroads on the available supply of water and it is imperative that studies be completed as soon as possible to ascertain the full requirements for water in the Okanogan-Similkameen area. Originally it was proposed to develop this area by a multiple-purpose reservoir at the Shanker's Bend site but this was delayed by international complications because the reservoir pool would have extended into Canada. One of the plans now being considered is a low dam at Palmer Lake which would not back water across the international boundary. The funds requested for fiscal year 1956 for this item are to initiate such studies.

The Spokane Valley project is an existing irrigation development along the Spokane River which includes some 10,000 acres of irrigation land. The present distribution system, which was constructed about 45 years ago has deteriorated so badly that extensive rehabilitation is needed. Without rehabilitation or reconstruction in the immediate future there is a strong possibility that irrigation may have to be abandoned, at least in part of the area. Funds are needed in fiscal year 1956 to complete the studies now under way to determine the feasibility of rehabilitating those facilities.

Mr. HORAN. This is a considerable increase over previous appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation in general investigations. I think the item is $5,175,000. So great is the interest, however, in this item that there are $475,000 being contributed at the present time by local groups to have these studies made, and I would like to talk to them if I might at this time.

A couple of years ago I was able to get a bill through with the help of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to allow Chief Joseph Dam to become multiple purpose. That brought it under the purview of the Bureau of Reclamation and made it possible to use a portion of that power there for pumping and other purposes that will enable us to rehabilitate and put new land under reclamation to the extent of some 75,000 acres, or perhaps more, because the bill authorizes the use of that power all the way from Grand Coulee clear down to the mouth of Moses Coulee, and there are lots of scattered lands that need reclaiming by irrigation.

FOSTER CREEK

There is an item which I will address myself to next, of $631,000 for actual construction at what is known as Foster Creek. I would would like to insert this statement in the record.

Mr. EVINS. It will be made a part of the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, FOSTER CREEK DIVISION, WASH.

The Foster Creek division of the Chief Joseph Dam project consists of three areas adjacent to the Columbia River in north-central Washington. These are the Blue Bottle Flat unit, the Bridgeport Bar unit, and the Brewster Flat unit.

In fiscal year 1956 the construction program of the Foster Creek division of the Chief Joseph Dam project requires an allotment of $631,000 of new appropriations. These funds will be expended on the continued collection of data for detailed designs, for the preparation of specifications, and for contract payments for earnings under contracts which will be awarded during the fiscal year. Funds will also be used to finance assistance in formation of irrigation districts and negotiation of repayment contracts. During fiscal year 1956, construction will be initiated on the facilities of one unit. On the other two units, work will be limited to preconstruction activity with construction scheduled to start in fiscal year 1957.

Work to date on this division has consisted of preconstruction studies and investigations leading to a definite plan report and the assembly of design data. All work prior to fiscal year 1956 has been financed from general investigations funds.

When completed, the Foster Creek division will provide full irrigation water for 4,550 acres and supplemental water for 1,130 acres presently irrigated. It will stabilize the economy by making substitute lands available for those which have gone out of fruit production and will create new wealth and economy for the growing population of the area.

Mr. HORAN. That is the land in the immediate vicinity of Chief Joseph Dam. However, in the upper Okanogan country, that area is supplied by water from Canada through the Similkameen and Okanogan Rivers. They cross the border there.

In 1940 we had a dry year and some of the land up there actually suffered drought at that time. Since 1940 British Columbia has grown by leaps and bounds. In fact Vancouver, British Columbia, is next only to Seattle as the largest city in the Pacific Northwest.

Since that time, waters which arise in British Columbia are being filed on in several instances by the Canadians themselves, and they

do not fully appreciate or recognize our treaty with them, the treaty of 1910. Consequently, if we were to have a quick runoff or a dry year, the people in my district in the upper Okanogan country would suffer. Right now studies are being made with the available funds for economic survey and feasibility studies in all of that area in the upper Okanogan down to Foster Creek, down to Greater Wenatchee, and farther on down to the mouth of Moses Coulee. So I am very anxious that we recognize that item in the budget which would bring the total up to $5,850,000, including the almost half million of private and local funds, so that these feasibility studies can be made.

We have another rehabilitation project in what is known as the Spokane Valley, a project that is about 40 years old, and it is in dire need of rebuilding. It will cost the Government nothing in the end; it will easily pay out. It is in a rather rich area that is rather thickly populated, but we want money to conduct these feasibility studies in that area.

The flume in the Spokane Valley project right now, which actually is seven separate little reclamation districts, called it Spokane Valley reclamation area, is so bad that you cannot even drive nails in it to hold. It is just held together by wishful thinking, I guess, and by virtue of a very good manager of that reclamation project.

For this Foster Creek division I just hope that you can see fit to allow those funds so that we can begin the work in connction with Chief Joseph Dam, which was, as I have said, an Army engineers dam, but which because of legislation was made multiple purpose and therefore will allow reclamation.

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

I have a statement on the Columbia Basin project that I would like to supply for the record.

Mr. EVINS. That will be received for the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT, WASHINGTON, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1956

In fiscal year 1956, the construction program of the Columbia Basin project requires an allotment of $12,500,000 of new appropriation. These funds will be expended almost entirely on the construction of additional irrigation facilities. By the end of fiscal year 1955, facilities to serve approximately 247,000 acres of land will have been constructed. These facilities will serve some 3,326 farm units. During fiscal year 1956, facilities to serve an additional 54,000 acres, made up of 674 farm units, will be completed. Construction of facilities for this acreage is currently under way and includes construction of laterals and drains as well as the necessary priming, testing, and a settler-assistance program.

During fiscal year 1956, work will be concentrated on irrigation facilities in blocks 14, 18, 47, 421, and 89, which make up the 47,000 acres scheduled for fiscal year 1957. Late in 1956 contracts will be awarded to construct laterals and pumping plant in blocks 77 and 79, which are a part of the 1958 scheduled acreage.

Much of the large canal network is complete to serve land now available for development. Two sections remain to be constructed. One is the short branch of the Wahluke Canal and the other is the Royal Branch of the West Canal. These facilities will serve the Wahluke slope and the Royal slope. Funds for initiation of construction of both remaining canal sections are included in the fiscal year 1956 appropriation request.

An economic study and evaluation of project benefits now under way will be completed. This study will be an analysis of the project's impact on the immediate area, the State, region, and the Nation as a whole. Minior activities in connection with preparing the town of Coulee Dam for transfer from Government ownership

to an incorporated status will be completed. A limited program of settler assistance and settlement land purchase and reseale will also be active.

With the increse in irrigated acreage, participation by private owners, State, county, and other Federal agencies in the settlement and development of the project has increased greatly. The Bureau of Reclamation has thus become more nearly an equal partner in the cooperative program for development of the project. It is probable that the annual Federal investment for project construction will, in the years immediately ahead, be equaled and surpassed by the aggregate, annual expenditures of the other participating individuals, groups, and agencies. However, a stable and recognized long-range program for project construction has been, and remains, a key factor in achieving timely provision of roads, utilities, credit, processing plants, and other public and private facilities essential to successful development of the project.

Mr. HORAN. It is $12.5 million. This is one we started when we began the old Grand Coulee Dam. In fiscal year 1956, the construction program of the Columbia Basin project requires an allotment of $12,500,000 of new appropriation. These funds will be expended almost entirely on the construction of additional irrigation facilities. By the end of fiscal year 1955, facilities to serve approximately 247,000 acres of land will have been constructed. These facilities will serve some 3,326 farm units. During fiscal year 1956, facilities to serve an additional 54,000 acres, made up of 674 farm units, will be completed. Construction of facilities for this acreage is currently under way and includes construction of laterals and drains as well as the necessary priming, testing, and a settler assistance program. That program and project is coming along very well.

M'NARY, CHIEF JOSEPH, AND THE DALLES DAMS

I would also like to testify, if I may, on the three dams which are of immediate interest to me. I would like to supply this statement for the record.

Mr. EVINS. That will be made a part of the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Since the end of World War II construction of dams and reservoirs for power and other purposes in the Pacific Northwest has been undertaken on a large scale by public and private sources to meet the constantly increasing market for electric power. Reactivation of war plants, continued expansion of population and industry, as well as increased consumption by all users including those industries partially or wholly supporting the defense effort, have eliminated the power surplus prevailing at the end of the war. Continued rapid expansion and industrial requirements appear certain.

Generating facilities now in existence plus completion of those under construction, primarily at McNary, Chief Joseph, and The Dalles, will enable the area to serve all of its firm loads in the period 1954–55 through 1959–60, although in any year that critical water conditions prevail steam-electric generation will have to be used and interruptible industrial loads curtailed. After the last of the presently scheduled generators is installed at the Dalles Dam in fiscal year 1961, assuming the schedule is maintained, total hydroresources will remain at a constant level, unless new projects not yet under construction are brought on the line. At the same time electric-energy requirements will continue to mount, thereby widening the gap between supply and demand.

At the present time there are six Federal multiple-purpose projects involving power under construction in the Pacific Northwest. Of these projects, Detroit has been completed insofar as power phases are concerned and Lookout Point and Albeni Falls will be substantially completed with funds appropriated to date. Installation of generating units at these latter two projects is not dependent on future appropriations.

The three remaining projects, namely, McNary, Chief Joseph, and The Dalles are major projects essential to the meeting of firm loads in the immediate future. These projects will require relatively large appropriations in fiscal year 1956 as

indicated below to keep construction and installation of generating units on schedule:

Project	Fund requirement fiscal year 1956	Balance to complete after fiscal year 1956
McNary	$11,000,000	$8,261,000
Chief Joseph	18,000,000	42,154,000
The Dalles	63,500,000	143,824,000

Six units have been installed to date at McNary and the final or 14th unit is scheduled to be placed on the line in December 1956. Initial power at Chief Joseph and The Dalles is scheduled for September 1955 and November 1957, respectively.

In closing, gentlemen, it is respectfully requested that funds required to keep the McNary, Chief Joseph, and the Dalles projects on schedule be made available to the Corps of Engineers.

The projects of the Corps of Engineers in the eastern part of the State of Washington are progressing extremely favorably and should be given the fullest measure of financial support in order to achieve the benefits at the earliest possible date. The Bureau of the Budget recommendations appear to take cognizance of the high priority and great economy of these developments and I believe public interest warrants their full support.

The Chief Joseph Dam is now nearing completion and progress has been extremely satisfactory. The total estimated cost has been reduced within the last year from $186,880,000 to $169,000,000. Progress has been ahead of schedule and loans from other projects have been necessary to meet contract payments. Appropriation requested for 1956 is $18 million, and with these funds the first power can be brought on the line in September of this year. I cannot overemphasize the importance to my area of maintaining this fine project on schedule.

The McNary project, as you know, was dedicated by the President last year, the first power having been brought on the line on schedule in 1953. The estimated cost of completion is $287,300,000 and $11 million is requested for 1956. The work under way is the continued installation of additional power units to complete the installed capacity of almost 1 million kilowatts. These units are being installed at the rate of one 70,000-kilowatt unit every 3 months. The seventh of these units is scheduled to go on the line in March 1955 and with the funds requested, five other units will be completed prior to the end of fiscal year 1956. This project is now producing great benefits to the region, both in terms of power and navigation. I assume there will be no difficulty about remaining completion funds.

The Dalles Dam, the third of the major structures on the mainstem of the Columbia, is now getting well under way. Progress has been excellent and the estimated cost of the project has been reduced within the last year from $348 million to $300 million, indicative of improvements in design and some extremely favorable bids. This project is now at a critical stage in its progress since the funds requested for fiscal year 1956 are the largest that will be necessary for any project this year; namely, $63,500,000. The project will produce a total of 1,092,000 kilowatts when complete and will remove another bottleneck to navigation on the Columbia River between Pasco, Wash., and the sea. At the present time there is still a major rapids at Celilo Falls and a constricted and obsolete bypass channel. The very great value of the power which will be produced by this project would make it poor economy to slow up progress now at this critical stage of its construction.

These big multipurpose projects are of tremendous regional and national importance and are of vital interest to every Congressman in the States concerned, whether or not they lie in his district.

I should also like to speak a word in favor of the approval of planning funds for the John Day Dam. The progress that is being made on constructing a number of multipurpose projects in the Northwest is extremely gratifying but I believe it is important that we should look further ahead. With the exception of the Dalles, which this year is approaching the peak of its appropriation schedule, all of the other multiple purpose projects in the Northwest are nearing completion. Four will be essentially complete this year. While I realize that we may not be able to continue with a program of the same magnitude that we have in the last few years, I do not believe it is intended that this program is to stop abruptly.

At this time we should look ahead to the next new start. I think it is unfortunate that on account of inadequate planning funds in the past, we are unable to consider the initiation of the John Day project in fiscal year 1956. I think it would be even more unfortunate if, due to continued shortsightedness, we should be unable to consider its initiation in fiscal year 1957. I recommend most strongly, therefore, the allocation of planning funds in the amount of $500,000 as a minimum in order that plans for this important project may be completed. I think this is the more important because it now appears that the Libby project, which we had hoped would be available as a new start, is now encountering so much delay on account of the Canadian discussions that we have to cast about for alternatives. Of the alternatives, the John Day project appears to be the most eligible at this time.

I should also like to speak for a moment of a very fine multiple purpose dam and reservoir project at Shankers Bend on the Similkameen River. Studies of this project are partially completed and funds in the amount of $10,000 were made available for fiscal year 1955 for completion of this study. However, the reservoir will extend into Canada for about 10 miles and completion of the investigation is contingent on Canada agreeing to provide the necessary flowage. The International Columbia River Engineer Board is investigating the plan of development for the basin under the International Joint Commission. No funds are required for this purpose in fiscal year 1956 but I am hopeful in the future that we can see construction initiated on this project.

Mr. HORAN. They are part of our power program out there, the McNary, Chief Joseph, and the Dalles Dams. We are quite proud of Chief Joseph because the original estimates were about $225 million and actually we are going to complete the dam at about $170 million, which is pretty good considering the estimates that we had.

At the present time there are six Federal multiple-purpose projects involving power under construction in the Pacific Northwest. Of these projects, Detroit has been completed insofar as power phases are concerned, and Lookout Point and Albeni Falls will be subsequently completed with funds appropriated to date. Installation of generating units at these two projects does not depend on future appropriations.

The three remaining projects, namely, McNary, Chief Joseph, and the Dalles are major projects essential to the meeting of firm loads in the immediate future. These projects will require relatively large appropriations in fiscal year 1956 as indicated below to keep construction and installation of generating units on schedule.

I think you have seen those figures. Six units have been installed to date at McNary and the final or 14th unit is scheduled to be placed on the line in December 1956. Initial power at the Chief Joseph and The Dalles is scheduled for September 1955 and November 1957, respectively.

I am particularly anxious to have this subcommittee seriously consider ample funds for surveying and planning money for the Army engineers. I say that because we do have in your present budget half a million for the John Day Dam, which is below the McNary Dam on the Columbia, and I trust that that will be allowed.

I might also say that about 3 miles from where I was born on the banks of the Columbia River we have under consideration at this time a partnership dam known right now as Rocky Reach, but we may name it after that Abe Lincoln rock that you have seen up there. The rock forms a very good profile of Abraham Lincoln. An excellent one. The dam will be built right where this profile rock is.

Mr. EVINS. I think it might be appropriate to suggest that the contributions should be given to name it the Horan Reach, because the gentleman who is testifying is an advocate, a staunch advocate of

reclamation and public power and multiple-purpose dam projects. You have been a very forceful and strong advocate of those programs which have meant so much to the people of your area.

Mr. HORAN. I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to say I have been in consultation with the Army engineers almost continuously for a couple of years on this Rocky Reach Dam, and also with the Bureau of the Budget, with the Department of Interior, and others. At this time it is my understanding that the Budget office is working on a survey and planning funds to complete the Army project in that stretch of the Columbia River at the headwaters of the reservoir at Rock Island up to the tailrace of the Chief Joseph Dam. I feel certain that there will be a supplemental request up here for $300,000 for that purpose. The Army engineers are very anxious to get started on this and the administration is very much interested in this.

I might say that the local people have employed Stone & Webster to make surveys and seismographic studies of the riverbed. They have found a new location other than what the Army engineers suggested in 1925 which presumably will be much cheaper to build since bedrock can be found much more quickly. Altogether it looks like a pretty good thing.

That is all I have to say, at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Horan, for your very fine statement. I believe most of the projects that you have testified about are included in the budget. The Rocky Reach project, as you indicated, is not in the justification before the committee at this time, but it may be considered in a supplemental.

Mr. HORAN. I wanted to apprise the subcommittee of that fact. It was mentioned, I might say, in the President's budget message, but I was not able to track down any pertinent detail in connection with it.

Mr. EVINS. The floodlighting situation at Grand Coulee that you mentioned is not included either.

Mr. HORAN. I appreciate that. I think it would be a nice thing and undoubtedly will be done sometime in the future.

Mr. JENSEN. I would also like to thank Mr. Horan for coming before the committee. He has been coming before the Interior Committee for the past 13 years that I know of.

Mr. HORAN. And I have always been very well received.

Mr. JENSEN. We always appreciate the fine testimony that you give us, which we can always depend upon.

Mr. HAND. He spends his life sitting on one side of the committee table or the other.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very kindly.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

CHEHALIS RIVER

WITNESS

HON. DON MAGNUSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. EVINS. The next gentleman is Congressman Magnuson. We are pleased to receive your testimony, Mr. Magnuson. You may proceed as you wish.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself just to one project today, which is not in the budget. I believe you heard about it before today from other witnesses. It is a request for an appropriation for deepening 5¼ miles of the existing channel at Grays Harbor and the Chehalis River in the State of Washington and the construction of a turning basin.

This project was authorized last year by title I of Public Law 780 of the 83d Congress, 2d session, as provided by House Document 412 of the 83d Congress, and would cost an estimated $421,800. An appropriation for the project, however, was not included, as I said, in the request submitted by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1956.

The urgent reason for my seeking an appropriation for the project at this time is that the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. has indicated its firm intention to construct a market-pulp mill in the Grays Harbor area at one of two points located adjacent to the portion of the river included in the authorized dredging project. The company expects to start construction about July 1 of this year and to start operations about September 1, 1956. The company has indicated that once the pulp mill is in operation, approximately 30 ships a year would be loading or discharging cargo at the Weyerhaeuser plant. The draft of these vessels, of the Liberty or Victory types, is such that they cannot negotiate the present channel, which is 26 feet deep for a 2½-mile stretch and only 18 feet deep over the remaining 3-mile portion, when fully loaded.

The proposed dredging project, which would deepen the channel to 30 feet, was justified on the grounds that it is necessary efficiently to accommodate the newer and larger vessels of the kind required for servicing the proposed pulp mill. The benefit-to-cost ratio on which the project was justified was computed on the basis of the modes of traffic existing in 1949 and 1950; obviously, the increased vessel traffic resulting from the construction of the pulp mill will yield a much more favorable benefit-to-cost ratio. As far as I can tell from reading the report of the district engineer, the vessels' movement to and from the proposed mill will come close to doubling the annual use of this stretch of the channel by the larger draft vessels.

The early construction of the pulp mill is of great importance to the neighboring communities. It is anticipated the plant will employ more than 400 men. The mill will help to stabilize the economy of the area, which is heavily dependent on the logging and lumber industry. It was estimated by the district engineer that the tributary area of the Chehalis River contained 70 billion board-feet of timber. In 1948, persons actively engaged in the logging, lumbering and allied wood-

products industries in Grays Harbor County alone comprised 50 percent of all employees in the county. The ratio in the outlying counties would be even higher.

In the interest of good planning and the full utilization of the waterway at Grays Harbor and the Chehalis River, I think it is important for the dredging to begin at the earliest practicable time. Therefore, I respectfully request, Mr. Chairman, that an appropriation for this project be included in the bill for fiscal 1956.

The situation has been changed somewhat since the authorizing legislation last year by the appearance of Weyerhaeuser with an indication of intention to construct this pulp mill, and I think, while the Bureau of the Budget did not include this item in the 1956 bill, that you would be justified in adding it to the bill. The work is contemplated at a somewhat early time. In any case, this community of Grays Harbor, mainly two cities, Hoquiam and Aberdeen, has been on the downgrade through reduction in sawmill activities. The pulp mill would be a great shot in the arm for the community. The dredging and improvement of this channel, of course, is necessary for an efficient operation of the pulp mill. I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Magnuson, for your fine statement.

Why did the Budget Bureau not include this item? Could you enlighten the committee on the Budget Bureau's action?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unfortunately I do not know why it was not included. I think the Budget Bureau was not in possession of the information. Perhaps I should not say that. I know they had the information on Weyerhaeuser's tentative plan as early as last November, so perhaps they did have the information on the prospective mill when they considered the budget.

Mr. EVINS. It is your view that $421,000 will substantially complete the job that is necessary, needed, and required.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the estimate of the Army engineers as presented to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. EVINS. The Army engineers have been recommending this project for some several years, I understand.

Mr. JENSEN. Have the Army engineers indicated that they will testify before this committee in favor of this item?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have some assurance on rather an informal basis from General Itschner that they would support the project. I have what I feel is assurance that if it does not get into the regular bill, the engineers will request it in their forthcoming supplemental bill.

Mr. JENSEN. When does Weyerhaeuser anticipate building this pulp mill? When would it be in operation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Their plan calls for beginning of the operations September 1, 1956.

Mr. JENSEN. A year from this coming September. How far would it be necessary for them to haul their pulp in order to load it on ships of the size that would be economically proper to load this pulp in the event this channel is not deepened so that the large ships can go up to their proposed mill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are two alternate proposed sites, but they are reasonably close together, say roughly 5 miles from the proposed site to the existing 30-foot channel, which is what they require.

Mr. JENSEN. An awful lot of lumber is loaded at Grays Harbor now, is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true.

Mr. JENSEN. I remember when I was in the lumber business getting lumber from Grays Harbor. In fact a good share of the lumber that came from that section of the country was shipped out of Grays Harbor. I naturally supposed it was a well-developed harbor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They badly need additional industrial property. Of course, as far as lumber goes, this is not a lumber operation. This is a pulp operation.

Mr. JENSEN. I understand that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They bring in a lot of cargoes such as sulfur and raw materials and so on for their own operation.

Mr. JENSEN. The harbor is the ship-loading center for a great area of your lumber there, is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is very true, yes. There is a very heavy shipment of lumber out of Grays Harbor. The improvement of this channel for this additional 5 miles unquestionably would attract other industry and provide locations for other industry and also certainly add to the ship traffic up the channel in addition to the 30 ships a year which Weyerhaeuser feels that its operation would involve.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand that private industry is not permitted to go in and dredge the harbor even if they wanted to? Is that right?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not sure, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. JENSEN. It is a navigable stream. They would have to get a permit to do it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am just not informed on that point.

Mr. JENSEN. You feel it is a Federal responsibility?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, and the engineers in their statement to the Public Works Committee last year, I recall, said that they felt it was a Federal responsibility. This deals with this specific problem, and this is part of their statement:

> The district engineer concludes that the improvement is economically justified and recommends it subject to conditions that local interests provide the land and rights of way and spoil-disposal areas.

The usual conditions, hold and save the United States free from damages and so forth.

Mr. HAND. Congressman, you used the phrase, I think, that the pulp mill had "indicated their intention" to construct. How firm are their claims to construct the mill at this site?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I anticipated that we might be questioned on that, and I have a letter in my hand to me from the pulp division of the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. under date of April 21, 1955, which answers the question on that specific point. I will read you pertinent parts:

They say—

> Your first question relates to our company's intention. It is our firm intention to build a pulp mill in the Grays Harbor area at a location yet to be selected on various plots of land under option or offered bordering the Chehalis River and in the section between the eastern boundary of the city of Aberdeen and the point where the eastern boundary of Cosmopolis crosses the river.

Cosmopolis is another town above Aberdeen.

> In any case the location would be adjacent to the portion of the river included in the approved dredging project.

And they go on to say:

We are prepared to proceed with this project if satisfactory agreement can be reached on such matters as waste disposal, harbor facilities, and our examination of the underground geological structures in that area. It would add materially to the attractiveness of the project if we could be sure that ocean shipping would be available from the plant site.

And they add this consideration:

* * * and that the fill from the dredging operations would be available to reduce the high costs which will be encountered in raising the land to a usable level.

I do not think that is of particular interest to this committee because the local community has the obligation of disposing of the spoils anyway.

I cannot say that this is an unequivocal commitment by the company, but they do say, "It is our firm intention to build a mill in the Grays Harbor area bordering the river," and in the section affected by this proposed improvement.

Mr. HAND. You used some sort of phrase, "if we can agree on harbor facilities" or something.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

* * * if satisfactory agreement can be reached on such matters as waste disposal—

which I presume are the waste liquids from the production of pulp—

harbor facilities, and our examination of the underground geological structures in that area.

Mr. HAND. Is it practical for the company to consider any site along the harbor or river which is already on a 30-foot basis?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. There is no site available.

Mr. HAND. Does that mean that all the sites are taken, or there just is not any other site which is physically good?

Mr. MAGNUSON. All those which would be suitable, at least, are taken. All the possible sites for an operation of this nature are used. I cannot say whether every piece of ground is in use. I know it is built up very solidly from my own recollection, down there along the channel.

Mr. HAND. How far is your source of supply from the approximate location where they propose to build their mill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The source of their raw material?

Mr. HAND. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot say in miles, Mr. Hand, but it is very convenient. They are in the heart of a great timber belt. Much of that would be suitable for pulp.

Mr. HAND. Thank you, sir.

Mr. EVINS. I believe that among some of the reasons advanced for going forward with this project right now is that this dredging will not just serve this plant alone but will serve other industries in the area and the shipping generally.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true.

Mr. EVINS. Regardless of whether or not the plant is built, you feel that the dredging project should go forward. It is not predicated upon that plant alone?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, it is not. I feel, however, that the Weyerhaeuser plan gives some additional urgency and perhaps justification for early action on this project. I do not want anybody to overlook

the fact that the engineers felt that they justified it without knowledge of Weyerhaeuser's plant.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Magnuson, very much for your fine statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the committee for giving me this time.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

WITNESS

HERBERT R. O'CONOR, WASHINGTON COUNSEL, AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE INSTITUTE, INC.

Mr. EVINS. Senator O'Conor, the committee will be very pleased to receive your testimony and statement.

Mr. O'CONOR. Thank you very much.

Mr. EVINS. Senator O'Conor is a former distinguished Senator and member of the other body.

Mr. O'CONOR. I appreciate indeed and consider it a privilege to be before you.

It occurred to me that possibly the most advisable manner in which I could lay before you the few considerations which I think might be worthy of your attention is to request the inclusion of the statement as a whole and then, without burdening you by reading it in full now, to attempt to highlight a few of the considerations, adding nothing new, because whatever I do say will be included in the statement.

Mr. EVINS. Your formal statement will be included in the record, and you may proceed as you desire.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE INSTITUTE, INC., ON NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS AND MAINTENANCE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1956

My name is Herbert R. O'Conor. I am Washington counsel for the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc. The American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., which represents the majority of American-flag ocean shipping of all categories, fully appreciates this opportunity of submitting to the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Committee on Appropriations this statement indicating its continuing concern over the delays due to lack of funds with respect to construction of vitally needed improvements in deepwater channels and harbors on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, to provide adequate depths, widths, and alinements for deep-draft vessels operated by the institute's member companies in those waterways through which essential materials are being transported.

The American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., is a trade association composed of 54 United States steamship companies, operating approximately 6 million gross tons of American-flag tank, dry-cargo, and collier vessels in the domestic and foreign trades of the United States.

TRENDS IN BULK CARRIER CONSTRUCTION

The trend in the past few years toward the planning of larger and larger vessels has been continuing, particularly in the field of tankers and ore carriers (see table I attached).

During the war years 1939–45, a total of 775 tankers with an aggregate dead weight of 12,010,643 tons were constructed. Of this tonnage 72 percent were T–2 tankers which had approximately 30 percent greater individual carrying capacity than the prewar tankers. The T–2 tankers proved so conclusively the value of the larger type vessel that the petroleum industry at the close of World

War II made plans for vessels of even greater capacity. The advantage of the supertanker is readily apparent from the fact that they can be operated with crews not greatly exceeding those required for the T–2 tankers, and at operating costs which are lower in proportion to the tonnage carried.

The trend toward further increase in size above the T–2 (16,600 deadweight tons) tankers is readily apparent from the fact that of a total of 272 tankers under contract and/or construction to American Bureau of Shipping standards in the period 1948 to December 1954, about 80 percent individually have a dead weight of 20,000 tons or greater. Eight vessels of about 45,000 deadweight tons are under contract or construction, 4 of which have already been launched. Four vessels of about 50,000 deadweight tons are under contract for early 1957 delivery. It is to be noted that the major tanker operators have over $1 billion invested in the new supertankers now afloat or under construction. Also worthy of note is the fact that these large tankers and ore carriers are approaching and in some cases exceeding the 762-foot length of the famous old liner *Mauretania* and they are considerably in excess of her beam of 88 feet.

In the 1953 report of the National Committee of the United States (Col. B. B. Talley, chairman) to the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses, table, World Tanker Construction, page 23 indicates that approximately 26 percent of the tankers under construction or on order are 30,000 deadweight tons and over. It is highly probable that to a large extent, existing tankers will be replaced by vessels of from 26,800 to 50,000 deadweight tons carrying capacity, having mean loaded salt-water drafts up to 37 feet, 6 inches. It is extremely urgent that the authorized navigation improvements be speeded up to complete the projects at the earliest practicable date since by 1957, it is estimated that the proportion of supertankers will constitute more than 25 percent of the total tanker fleet using United States ports.

The opening of foreign ore sources, distant from the important world markets, since the close of World War II has brought bulk ore carriers of unprecedented size ranging up to dead weight of 60,000 tons, with drafts, of 37 feet, 6 inches. Three of these vessels are already launched and are trading in several United States ports, but actual estimate of cargo tonnages for the various terminals have not been received to date. The trend toward larger bulk ore carriers is evident from the statistics on ore carriers as shown in table I.

NAVIGATION PROJECTS TO BE IMPROVED

The authorized improvements to our deepwater harbors and channels would not only be of value from a standpoint of widespread benefits to our economy, as has been recognized by the Congress, but with improvement these projects would also serve a vital function in a war emergency. Overseas shipment of petroleum products and other strategic commodities in the interest of national defense could be efficiently transported in the new large type vessels with their greater capacity and high speeds ranging up to 18 knots. It is of the utmost importance in the interest of our national defense that the deep-channel ports where petroleum in bulk is loaded in deep-draft tankers and the deep-channel ports where these tankers are discharged be given prime consideration during these times in order to effect the maximum economy in tanker use.

The American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., is very appreciative of the funds which have been recommended by the President to the Congress in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Since the AMMI realizes that the desires of the President and the Congress are to carefully evaluate all proposed expenditures for the forthcoming year, it has selected a list of the important projects which should be given first priority to early completion.

Table II lists those important authorized projects which have been included in the Presidential budget and also indicates the minimum amounts urgently recommended by the AMMI to be appropriated by the Congress. It is to be noted that in three cases, that of the New York and New Jersey Channels, the Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge, and the Houston Ship Channel, Tex., are the recommended amounts greater.

The importance of these harbors, well known to the Congress are briefly summarized:

1. Portland Harbor, Maine, is the terminus of the petroleum pipeline supplying various large cities both in the United States and Canada. Operations at this port are of great importance to the defense effort and are continuous throughout the entire year. Extreme hardship is imposed on shippers by the lack of a 35-foot anchorage for the numerous modern deep-draft vessels entering this 35-foot dredged harbor.

TABLE II.—*Appropriations, fiscal year 1956, list of important navigation projects on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts listed in Presidential budget*

Project	Estimated cost to complete	Amount in Presidential budget	Recommended by AMMI
1. Portland Harbor, Maine	$820,000	$820,000	$820,000
2. Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., etc	952,000	400,000	400,000
3. Mystic River, Mass	4,500,000	500,000	500,000
4. New York and New Jersey channels [1]	20,000,000	3,000,000	5,000,000
5. Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge, New York [1]	7,654,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
6. Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (Mantua Creek), Pa	1,600,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
7. Norfolk Harbor, Va. (Craney Island disposal area)	4,600,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
8. Norfolk Belt Line Railroad Bridge	2,302,000	800,000	800,000
9. Charleston Harbor, S. C	200,000	200,000	200,000
10. Tampa Harbor, Fla	4,434,000	977,000	977,000
11. Mobile Harbor, Ala	3,446,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
12. Houston Ship Channel, Tex (resumption) [1]	3,650,000	500,000	1,500,000
13. Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, Tex	781,000	600,000	600,000
14. Corpus Christi Bridge, Texas	3,590,000	1,500,000	1,500,000

[1] AMMI recommends the increases in these projects as indicated.

2. Portsmouth Harbor, N. H., has a natural 34-foot channel which is limited to an 18-foot depth by rock outcrops at Gangway Rock, the southwest point of Badgers Island, and Boiling Rock. The benefits to be derived by the improvement, in the elimination of delays in waiting for daylight high slack water and repair costs which in one instance amounted to $132,000 as well as 50 days lost time, make it imperative that the work be initiated early.

3. The lack of an adequate channel in the Mystic River imposes serious delays on vessels using this port. For 1 company alone, there were 1,020 hours of delay experienced by 170 tanker trips to this port in 1950. The costs of delays to tankers waiting for high tide, computed at the Maritime Commission rate of $120 per hour, total more than $150,000 per annum.

4. The New York and New Jersey Channels are among the most important in the world, and the completion of the authorized improvements at the present rate of appropriations will take about 6 years. In this interval, ships using this port will continue to be seriously handicapped because of loading limitations. It is therefore urged that the present rate of appropriations be stepped up so that the full benefits of the authorized improvements can be fully realized.

5. The Staten Island Rapid Transit drawbridge across Arthur Kill, N. Y. and N. J., causes an unreasonable obstruction to modern ships and its removal has been ordered as of July 5, 1949. Delays encountered at the bridge are now seriously paralyzing industry located on this waterway. Final plans for the bridge are under review and construction is being awaited anxiously. It is therefore urged that the sum of $2 million be appropriated for the early initiation of this important work.

6. Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea (Mantua Creek, Pa.): This appropriation for the deepening and enlarging of the Mantua Creek anchorage area is necessary since the existing anchorage areas are insufficient to handle commerce in the new large vessel length and draft utilizing the Delaware River.

7. Norfolk Harbor (Craney Island disposal area), Va.: With the vast amount of dredging in this important harbor, the previous areas set aside for disposal of the dredged material have been filled to capacity. The new appropriation is a must to enable new and maintenance dredging to continue in this most important defense and industrial area.

8. The Norfolk-Portsmouth Belt Line Railroad bridge has long been a menace to navigation and losses encountered because of the bridge have been enormous. Immediate action to alleviate this menacing structure should be undertaken for the safety and economical movement of navigation.

9. Provision of another channel in Charleston Harbor east and north of Drum Island in Cooper River would lessen the hazards to navigation present with only the one existing 35-foot channel, which is close to the wharves along the west shore of Town Creek. This additional channel would be more practical from the standpoint of the defense effort.

10. At Tampa Harbor, there is a single high tide on most days and the delays awaiting suitable tide are as long as 10 hours. On the basis of present receipt of petroleum products these delays result in losses estimated at over $150,000 annually. In addition, the loading of vessels to this port must be limited to

drafts of 28 feet 6 inches instead of 30 feet 2 inches (draft of the fully loaded T–2 tanker). This is equivalent to a tonnage loss of 1,200 tons per vessel: i. e., for the T–2 tanker, and would be a much greater loss for the larger type tanker. Restriction on loading the T–2 tanker results in an additional annual loss of more than $200,000.

11. Mobile Harbor, Ala., is a port of entry and shipping outlet for an extensive area which is rich in mineral resources. The appropriations are urgently needed to provide a channel that will serve the carriers of metallic ores and crude oil in the large superore and tanker vessels. Annual benefits of over $1 million can only be attained with an early completion of this most important project.

12. The Houston Ship Channel, Tex., is one of the most important major deep-channel ports in the United States for the loading of petroleum in bulk in deep-draft tankers. Petroleum commerce now exceeds 31 million tons per annum. Now under consideration is a proposed $32 million plan to build 15 wharves which would almost double the public wharf facilities at the port. The existing project provides for a 36-foot depth whereas the actual depth between Baytown and the Houston turning basin has been dredged to only 32 feet. This imposes serious restrictions to the petroleum industry.

13. We have strongly been recommending funds for the Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway since 1949. About 23 million short tons of petroleum products per annum originate on this waterway. It is most urgent that adequate channel depths and widths be provided from the jetty entrance to the turning basin, including straightening of the channel at the entrance to the turning basin to permit safe transit and turning of tankers.

14. The Corpus Christi Bridge, situated at the entrance to the turning basin, has been declared a hazard to navigation and has been ordered to be removed. Funds should be appropriated to immediately remove this hazardous condition and permit the unimpeded flow of large tanker traffic to this most important port where petroleum in bulk is loaded in deep-draft tankers.

The American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., on behalf of its member companies also wishes to ask the Congress to appropriate funds for those projects listed in table III which have not been listed in the recommendation by the President in the budget for the fiscal year 1956.

TABLE III.—*Appropriations, fiscal year 1956 list of important navigation projects on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts not listed in the presidential budget*

Project	Estimated cost to complete	Recommended by AMMI
1. Town River, Mass	$525,000	$300,000
2. Hudson River, New York to Albany, N. Y	32,000,000	1,000,000
3. Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton, Pa	91,389,000	6,000,000
4. Wilmington Harbor (Cape Fear River to Wilmington)	2,600,000	750,000
5. Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex	6,875,000	1,000,000
6. James River, Va. (survey report)	157,000	157,000
7. Richmond Harbor, Calif	2,086,000	1,000,000
8. Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington	8,555,000	3,000,000

These projects are also important and are briefly summarized herein:

1. Town River, Quincy, Mass. is inadequate for modern T-class tankers now in general use and annual transportation savings in the efficient use of these vessels would be derived from reducing delays due to waiting for favorable tidal, daylight, and weather conditions, elimination of lightering, quicker turn-around time, and reduction in towboat charges. The savings would amount to about $128,000 annually for an improved 27-foot channel, for a benefit-cost ratio of about 4.6.

2. The existing 27-foot channel in Hudson River has become inadequate as a result of the increased size of merchant vessels using the waterway. Modification of the project to provide a 32-foot depth of channel to accommodate the larger vessels would derive widespread annual benefits of over $2 million. The AMMI members have been urging this modification since 1945 and are now requesting the Congress to initiate appropriations to start the improvement.

3. The Delaware River, from Philadelphia to Trenton, requires a superchannel for the supertype ships which will use the waterway after improvement. The area along the banks of the Delaware River is available for vast expansion and it is in the public interest that the deeper channel should be provided. The Delaware River Port area reached an alltime high in foreign waterborne com-

merce in the first half of 1954, with an increase of 13 percent over the same period in 1953. Private enterprise has and will invest its resources in an unprecedented industrial expansion in the region to the benefit of the defense program and the future normal peacetime economy. It is in the hands of the Congress to appropriate funds to continue this expansion.

4. Wilmington Harbor (Cape Fear River to Wilmington) N. C. is another of the major ports at which serious delays occur due to an inadequate channel. Delays in this port are occasioned by waiting for favorable tidal conditions and are estimated to result in penalties of approximately $90,000 per annum.

5. The Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex. is a vital oil-loading port which becomes all the more important in time of an all-out national emergency. The use of the modern large tankers in this waterway has not been considered safe since the terminals can only be reached after rounding numerous sharp and narrow bends. The annual savings due to the channel modifications and enlargements and curve easings are estimated to be in excess of the estimated annual charges of the improvements.

6. The James River Channel from Newport News to Richmond, Va., with about 5 million tons of waterborne commerce, is an important port with water of only 25 feet. The preliminary report authorized by the Congress was favorably reported on by the district, division, and Chief of Engineers. However, no further action has been forthcoming since no funds have been allocated for a survey report. If the project is worth while then funds should be allocated to determine its merit. An outlay of $157,000 will permit the Corps of Engineers to determine the vast benefits to be derived from the further improvement of a port which is only capable of handling prewar type vessels.

7. Richmond Harbor, Calif., is 1 of 4 commercial deepwater ports in the San Francisco Bay area. A 35-foot channel with adequate widths as authorized by the Congress is required for the continued increase in commerce in deep-draft vessels and economically justified by transportation savings.

8. A 48-foot depth of water is necessary for the safety and convenience of shipping in the Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. The benefits that will accrue to navigation both in transportation savings and elimination of groundings fully justifies congressional appropriations to initiate and complete dredging at an early date.

The major tanker operators have over $1 billion invested in the new supertankers now afloat or under construction. The full value of these tankers to the national economy is not now being realized under the loading handicaps imposed by those channels of inadequate depth and width. It seems to us imperative that direct and immediate action should be taken to complete these major loading and unloading port projects within the earliest practicable time.

The benefits from the use of the large tankers in the completed deepwater ports would be far reaching since their employment at full capacity would result in corresponding savings in transportation costs. There is no type of harbor improvement from which the benefits are more promptly realized and none in which the benefits are as great as those involving the movement of crude oil and crude-oil products.

It is not enough that the authorized projects be carried to completion. Once the channel improvements are completed, they are committed to the use of deeper draft vessels and to the loading of the ships to the fullest extent of their capabilities. If channels are allowed to deteriorate and navigable depths are decreased by silting, great inconvenience and loss will be experienced. It is for this reason that we ask the Congress that the funds as set up in the Presidential budget be appropriated to insure the efficient and economic use of the deepwater channel on the east and gulf coasts.

TABLE I.—*Trends in vessel construction*

TYPICAL OIL CARRIERS

Date	Vessel	Overall length	Breadth	Mean summer salt-water draft	Speed knots	Dead-weight tonnage
		Feet Inches	*Feet Inches*	*Feet Inches*		
1906	W. S. Porter	399 2	49 9	24 0	9½	6,500
1908	Texas	413 3	52 0	24 0	12	9,232
1914	John D. Archibald	474 6	60 0	26 1	10¼	9,546
1916	Charles Pratt	516 6	68 0	27 3	10½	15,955
1918	USSB tankers	445 0	59 7	25 6	10	10,000
1941	T–2 tankers (T2–SE–A1)	523 6	68 0	30 2	14½	16,500
1943	Atlantic Sun	547 3	70 0	30 4½	15	17,910
1948	Esso Zurich	628 0	80 6	31 11	16	26,555
1950	Atlantic Seaman	659 6	85 0	34 3¼	17	30,155
1953	Tina Onassis	775 8	95 0	37 0	16	45,000
1953	Petroking	673 0	92 0	34 7¾	15	38,000
1954	W. Alton Jones	707 0	93 0	36 6	17½	38,000
1954	World Glory	736 6	102 0	37 6½	16½	45,110
1955	Under contract in France for Tide-water Association	782 0	102 0	37 6	16½	50,000

TYPICAL BULK ORE CARRIERS

1922	Marore	571 6	78 0	34 1	11	22,980
1945	Venore	582 11	78 0	34 4	16¼	24,376
1954	Ore Chief	794	116 0	37 6	14	60,000
1955	Hull 1237–England	650 (B. P.)	88 0			31,000

Mr. O'CONOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I happen to be the Washington counsel for the American Merchant Marine Institute, which is a trade association composed of 54 United States steamship companies which operate approximately 6 million gross tons of American-flag tank, dry cargo, and collier vessels in both the foreign and the domestic trade of the United States.

Among the considerations, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, which I should like to stress is the peculiar situation which confronts the shipping industry and which they think has a direct relationship and particular applicability to the appropriations which have been recommended, and in support of which we are appearing before you. In order to indicate the change and the development in the industry which we think shows the imperative need for the appropriations, we attempt to advance these arguments.

During the war years from 1939 to 1945 a total of 775 tankers with an aggregate weight of 12 million tons were constructed. Of this tonnage 72 percent were the T–2 tankers which had approximately 30 percent greater individual carrying capacity than the prewar tankers. These T–2 tankers proved so conclusively the value of the larger type vessel that the petroleum industry at the close of World War II made plans for vessels of even greater capacity.

The advantage of the supertanker is readily apparent from the fact that they can be operated with crews not greatly exceeding those required for the T–2 tankers—and this we note with particular emphasis—at operating costs which are lower in proportion than the tonnage which is carried.

They have passed the experimental stage and passed the talk stage. At this time 8 vessels of about 45,000 deadweight tons are actually under contract or under construction, 4 of which have already been launched. Four vessels of about 50,000 deadweight tons are

under contract for early delivery in 1957. It is to be noted that the major tanker operators have over $1 billion invested in the new supertankers now afloat or under construction.

Then, so that we all may have an idea, rather than just using cold statistics, I point to the fact that these large tankers, and ore carriers as well, are approaching, and in some cases they actually exceed, the 762-foot length of the famous old liner *Mauretania* and they are considerably in excess of her beam of 88 feet.

Then, too, another recent development which has, we think, aggravated the general situation and calls for extraordinary measures is the fact that the opening of the foreign ore sources distant from the important world markets since the close of World War II has brought bulk ore carriers of unprecedented size ranging up to deadweight of 60,000 tons with drafts of 37½ feet. Again I say that while we talk about or have heard a lot of talk about these in years past and thought that that was possibly just a dream, three of these vessels are already launched and are trading today in several United States ports but the actual estimates of cargo tonnages for the various terminals have not yet been received up to date, and therefore, we are unable to give the committee the exact detailed information except to say that they are in actual operation, and with this important further fact: That in preparation for our appearance before you gentlemen, we caused a general survey to be made in order to bring the most authoritative information as to what might be expected in the way of the greater use of the supertanker with the result that from all the member companies, and using it as a composite, we find that 25 percent of the total tanker fleet using United States ports will actually, by 1957, be supertankers.

I am sure it is unnecessary to emphasize to you very well informed gentlemen the benefits of that particular type in any war emergency.

Mr. Chairman, and other gentlemen, that brings us to the list of the different projects which have been included in the President's budget and which we support, except that I should like, if I may, to highlight three specific projects, only because we think they are illustrative of what we consider the needs to be. The first is the New York and New Jersey Channels which are, as you gentlemen know, among the most important in the entire world, and under present conditions, because we do suggest possibly an increase in order to avail of the full potential of these very important facilities, the completion of the authorized improvements at the present rate of appropriations will take about 6 years.

In this interval ships using this port will continue to be seriously handicapped because of the loading limitations which now obtain. We, therefore, respectfully urge that the present rate of the appropriations be stepped up so that the full benefits of the authorized improvements can be fully realized.

Then, leaving the New York and New Jersey section, I should like if I may, to invite your attention to the Houston, Tex., ship channel, which is one of the most important major deep channel ports in the United States for the loading, as you of course know so well, of petroleum in bulk in deep-draft tankers. We were quite surprised, I may say, and struck with the fact upon compiling the grand total of the commerce from the various petroleum industries to note that the

petroleum commerce today exceeds in that port 31 million tons per annum.

Now under consideration is a proposed $32 million plan to build 15 wharves which would almost double the present wharf facilities of that import port. Yet the existing project provides for a 36-foot depth, whereas the actual depth between Baytown and the Houston turning basin has been dredged to only 32 feet, which we, of course, submit represents a serious restriction to the petroleum industry, and we think this could more than pay for itself.

If it is to be done eventually, to use the very apt expression, why not now, because we think that the benefits to be derived not only for the general public insofar as their comfort and all that, but looking at it from the dollar and cents standpoint, would reflect a sizable intake.

The third of the several ones which we think deserve special consideration is the Staten Island Rapid Transit drawbridge, which, incidentally, was ordered removed as of July back in 1949, almost 6 years ago. The delays which have been encountered at the bridge are now seriously paralyzing the industry located on this waterway. Final plans for the bridge are under review and construction is being awaited anxiously. We think that the increase to $2 million for the early initiation of this important work would be thoroughly justified.

Then, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, just in conclusion, may I attempt to highlight the entire testimony which I am privileged to give by laying emphasis again upon the fact that the major tanker operators have over $1 billion invested in the new supertankers, either the ones that are afloat or under construction. The full value of these tankers to the national economy is not now being realized under the loading handicaps which are imposed and result from channels of inadequate depth and inadequate width.

It seems to us, therefore, imperative that direct and immediate action should be taken to complete these major loading and unloading port projects within the earliest practicable time. The benefits from the use of the large tankers in the completed deepwater ports would be far reaching since their employment at full capacity would result in corresponding savings in transportation costs. There is no type of harbor improvement from which the benefits are more promptly realized and none in which the benefits are as great as those involving the movement of the cargoes to which I have made reference.

Mr. Chairman, I think that might just in a general way highlight my statement.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Senator O'Conor, for your fine statement and consideration. I am sure the committee will give consideration to the argument you made.

Mr. HAND. I understand quite well the almost economic necessity of building these oil carriers and ore carriers larger and larger because of the enormous cost of our maritime labor as one of the factors involved. You cannot operate economically, or at least you ought not to try, unless you can get these ships larger. Where are we going to draw a line? Are we going to keep having to build bigger and bigger channels all the time?

Mr. O'CONOR. You certainly put your finger on a very, very pivotal, and we think a very perplexing, problem. I recall so distinctly sitting on a committee on the other side some years ago when

certain of the present plans were first projected, and they seemed almost fantastic, and yet the competition from abroad and the problems presented by the increasing wage scales, labor costs, and material seem just to compel it. Yet, I do think there is a danger point beyond which you cannot go, because, just coming a littler closer home to our own port just 40 miles away from here in Baltimore, we have had a very, very troublesome and a very difficult problem for the very reason that you point out.

We thought some years back that it had been dredged to a depth sufficient to take care of the matter for many years, and yet almost before the completion of the work, there was more required. I think there has to be some thought given on the other side, too, and I think prudence in business operation calls for that.

Mr. HAND. Senator, since the United States is being advised to spend more and more money to make bigger and better channels all the time, what would be your comment in behalf of the maritime industry if Congress should ultimately consider the imposition of navigation fees for the use of these waterways?

Mr. O'CONOR. I do not think I am authorized possibly to speak for the industry and certainly on the record in regard to it, because that is a very, very difficult and many-sided question. We feel that, of course, the benefits accruing in the overall economy and also as an arm of defense, does place the industry in a somewhat different situation from the ordinary individual road user or other user of facilities, so that we think that where the shipping industry is required to keep itself in readiness for possible emergency use, as, of course, recent world conflicts pointed up the necessity for, it would be possibly a too difficult burden to carry.

Mr. HAND. Especially in view of the fact that you have already been subsidized.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is true. I had that in the back of my head.

Mr. HAND. Senator, how do you define the "New York and New Jersey Channels"? What do you include as you use the term?

Mr. O'CONOR. There is, as you gentlemen undoubtedly know, the series of the channels there which are in use for oceangoing draft and for all the ships that either in——

Mr. HAND. In or pertaining to New York Harbor?

Mr. O'CONOR. Yes.

Mr. HAND. You do not include the Delaware River?

Mr. O'CONOR. No; we don't.

Mr. HAND. Does your client have any interest in deepening the Delaware from Philadelphia to Trenton?

Mr. O'CONOR. Yes; and thanks to you gentlemen in the past Congress, that was pointed up very decidedly.

Mr. HAND. You spoke about the improvement of the channel in Houston or at least maintaining the authorized depth of 36 feet?

Mr. O'CONOR. Yes.

Mr. HAND. Would your 50,000-ton oil carriers or your 60,000-ton ore carriers be able to use that channel even if it were 36 feet?

Mr. O'CONOR. Actually, it is 37½, their maximum, but we did think that the use that could be made by increasing from 32 to 36 would possibly make them usable at least for the foreseeable future.

Mr. HAND. Let me put the question in this way: In your judgment and in the judgment of your industry, is a channel depth of less than

40 feet a safe depth for transportation of such vessels you are mentioning?

Mr. O'CONOR. For the supertanker, at full capacity, that would be the safer depth to hit for.

Mr. HAND. Thank you very much.

Mr. O'CONOR. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

SACRAMENTO RIVER

WITNESS

RALPH B. DEWEY, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PACIFIC AMERICAN STEAMSHIP ASSOCIATION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will come to order. I understand Mr. Dewey is the next witness to appear before the committee.

Mr. Dewey, will you give the committee your full name, your address, your organization, and also tell the committee whether or not the matters on which you are going to testify concern the western section.

Mr. DEWEY. I will do that, thank you, Mr. Evins. My name is Ralph B. Dewey. I am the Washington representative of the Pacific American Steamship Association, with headquarters in San Francisco, Calif.

I am addressing myself today to only one project in the civil functions budget, which actually is not set down for any amount of money in this year's budget, but which I am given to understand will be the subject of separate hearings at a later date in these proceedings, and I therefore requested an opportunity to be heard on this matter.

SACRAMENTO SHIP CANAL

This item is the Sacramento ship channel, which is a project approved by the Public Works Committee, and passed by Congress and for which there has been expended to date in the neighborhood of $2½ million. The total of the project is estimated to be in the order of $30 million.

In opposing this project, I would remind you that, as steamship operators, we always are in favor of increased port facilities which will prove out in an economic sense. We certainly have no "dog in the manger" attitude toward any port development which will benefit the commerce of our country, because as such, our own steamship companies will benefit.

In the case of the Sacramento ship channel, however, we take strong issue with the economic factors which are the ingredients of the cost-benefit ratio that the Army engineers show in their report, that is in their January 1954 revised report. The Army engineers first published a report on this project in 1946 and later in 1954, last year, they revised their figures and at present the cost-benefit ratio stands at 1.15 to 1, slightly better than break-even.

We take issue with that cost-benefit ratio on three counts:

The first is on the overall tonnage projection, which is on a 50-year basis and for which the Corps of Engineers shows an average annual movement in the Sacramento River of 741,000 tons of cargo.

We take issue on the second count on the average load per vessel call that they estimate will be lifted from this port of Sacramento when it is built.

Thirdly, we take issue with the vessel cost per day which is used in the calculation of the cost-benefit ratio.

These three ingredients are extremely important because the product of these three ingredients, namely, the tonnage projection, the average lift per vessel, and the cost of the vessel per day, of diversion determine the savings per ton of cargo which will be made as a result of the construction of this port. It stands to reason that if the ingredients of the savings are in error, the savings themselves are in error.

The engineers have made a showing of a 69-cents-per-ton saving. Gentlemen, we have operated steamships on the Pacific coast since 1849. The companies in my association date back, at least two of them, that many years, and we take a certain amount of pride in not running operations that lose money. But for us to take a merchant vessel up a narrow 100-mile inland waterway to pick up a fractional load of cargo and return to the central part of the San Francisco Bay, is a losing proposition for any cargo liner under today's vessel costs. We figure that in order for Sacramento shippers to save 69 cents per ton we have to spend 3 to 4 dollars per ton to take our ship up the channel and back again. What kind of economic saving is that?

For this reason our primary interest today is that this item under no consideration be reinstated in the President's budget until such time as the Army engineers reevaluate the entire project from the standpoint of the economics involved.

As ship operators, we know we cannot run ships up there that far from the central part of the bay and make any kind of a showing, certainly not that will yield any savings per ton. As a matter of fact, in the hearings last year, I pointed out that from our standpoint, one of the biggest commodities—and the Army engineers confirms this in their studies—is canned goods moving out of the port of Sacramento. If this $30 million project were built and the canned goods started to flow and were offered to our ships, it would be offered in lots, not of 3,500 tons, upon which the engineers base their estimates, but on smaller lots of maybe 800 tons, and that is on the high side. That is the normal canned goods offering. You just don't move canned goods in 3,500-ton lots.

The result would be, then, when you take a merchant ship at that distance to divert it out of its traffic pattern for 2 or 3 or 4 days to make this lift at a cost of $3,200 a day for the vessel alone, the tonnage isn't there, the profit isn't there, and the ships would not call.

When the initial project was brought before Congress at a cost of $10 million, there may have been some justification, and you may have been able to make an economic showing on a port at Sacramento. But today, when the cost has skyrocketed to $30 million and we know a little bit more about postwar traffic patterns, we suggest that the Army engineers be mandated to reevaluate the project.

Until this is done, we think the Appropriations Committee and the Congress itself will be making a decision on facts which are not supported by actual operations.

May I just button this point down by noting that the figures upon which this project was based initially were prewar figures and that postwar traffic statistics of the engineers themselves show dry-cargo trade to be 33 percent less in the San Francisco Bay than prewar. This, I think, alone, should compel members of this committee to withhold any judgment on this project until it is reevaluated in light of the actual traffic pattern and in light of increasing ship costs, in order that the proper judgment may be made.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Dewey, it strikes me rather singular that the shipping industry would be opposing the development of a harbor that would give more shipping.

Mr. DEWEY. I prefaced my remarks, Mr. Evins, by saying that we are in here many times asking for funds supporting port development items.

Mr. EVINS. You are generally asking for funds to improve the harbors and for dredging, but here is a situation in which the shipping industry comes in and says, "We are against it."

Mr. DEWEY. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. Would it affect you competitively if another shipping company came into this area to take the cargo out of the Sacramento harbor?

Mr. DEWEY. I represent 12 steamship lines, which is about three-quarters of the tonnage that operates on the Pacific coast. We could all use Sacramento if it is built.

Mr. EVINS. The steamship companies are subsidized by the Government in many ways, but I am just trying to find out the reasons for your fundamental objection to the development of the harbor. That is for my own benefit if not for the record.

Mr. DEWEY. Of course, first of all, we don't like to see Federal funds expended for something that is not going to at least break even. We would like an opportunity for hearings before the Chief of Engineers to show why we don't think this thing will make money.

Mr. EVINS. Were you for this project initially?

Mr. DEWEY. No, sir; not when it was $10 million and certainly not now.

Mr. EVINS. You were against it right along?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes, sir. The reason for that is that we have in the San Francisco Bay four ports that are in the central fulcrum of the water area known as the San Francisco Harbor. Those four ports, as a result of a recent study by the senate of the State of California were shown to only be used to about 50 percent of their possible utilization. There are heavy investments in those existing ports. They are quite adequate and we therefore cannot find ourselves in position of supporting another port which is off at the far end of the spoke, so to speak. We would have to divert a ship up 1 day, load 1 day or more, and back another day, whereas we have all the facilities for loading Sacramento-origin cargo at ports in the central part of the bay. Further, the tolls and other charges we pay is depended on to amortize them.

Mr. EVINS. Your position is that there are adequate port facilities and that you do not need any additional works in the particular area?

Mr. DEWEY. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. Are you requesting, or would you favor any funds for the development of any competing ports?

Mr. DEWEY. Of competing ports?

Mr. EVINS. Yes.

Mr. DEWEY. We are, sir.

Mr. EVINS. You do not think it is economically sound and feasible to develop Sacramento?

Mr. DEWEY. We don't feel that it is, no.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not understand your testimony. You say that you opposed this project originally. I understand this project was originally started in 1946.

Mr. DEWEY. 1945 and 1946.

Mr. MURRAY. Some work had been done subsequent to 1945 and 1946 and it was stopped because of the Korean war, as I understand the situation.

Mr. DEWEY. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY. I understand you opposed the project originally, and you are opposing it now. The reason you are opposing it now is because you feel that a reevaluation of the economics involved is necessary at this time. The project was originally proposed, you say, on the basis of war considerations. Upon what was your original opposition predicated?

Mr. DEWEY. I would have to check the record on that, Mr. Murray.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that your testimony or your statement does not carry too much weight. You now say there has been some changes since the original construction, that caused Congress, or somebody, to start this project, that there has been some economic change, and that we should evaluate the economic change, but you tell us that you had opposition to it initially. I think there is an inconsistentcy in your position.

Mr. DEWEY. I don't see that that is inconsistent, sir. I don't follow the inconsistency which you pick out of there.

Mr. MURRAY. Well, you suggest to us that the reason we should not consider this project at the present time is because the economics upon which it was based were predicated upon matters pertaining to pre-war conditions, but you tell us now that you also opposed it at the time of its original authorization. It seems to me that that is inconsistent.

Mr. DEWEY. I haven't reread the record for a number of years as to why our association opposed the original project. My recollection is, however, that we opposed it because we didn't think there had been enough showing in the postwar period to see if we needed another port in northern California; that we had at that time five major ports, and did not feel the necessity of another port, and we still don't, and for reasons which we would like an opportunity to develop at a reevaluation hearing before the engineers whom we think should make these decisions on more realistic grounds.

Mr. MURRAY. Is your principal objection to the furtherance of this project predicated upon the needs or the convenience of the public and public welfare or is your principal objection to the project because of its effect on your particular interests?

Mr. DEWEY. A little of both, to be honest, Mr. Congressman. This is an argument that has been going on, at least from my reading of history, since about at least 500 B. C. That is, whether you are going to take the ship to the cargo or move the cargo to the ship. That really underlies our presence here in these proceedings.

There is a point beyond which a transportation line cannot afford to serve everybody's front yard, and we have drawn the line at Sacramento and said, in effect, "You have four points at the hub of your bay. They are sufficiently close to each other that it is a matter of 15, 20 steaming minutes, maybe up to 40 or 45 at the most, between those ports. The shift is a matter of a few hours. Each port has its own function and serves the shipping industry and the general public of northern California more than adequately.

We have also another port which is in the Central Valley, the port of Stockton, which serves to a great degree a similar, perhaps not identical, but a very similar hinterland that the port of Sacramento suggests that they will serve.

So you already have the Central Valley served with an interior port.

Frankly, the steamship operators have not over the past years relished the idea of even going to Stockton for cargoes. We have tonnage limits, and will not go up there except for at least 500 tons of cargo, and many ship operators turn up their noses at even that because they can't make any money at it. It is often a courtesy call to service some large shipper. You still have to reckon with the unit cost of carrying a commodity, and we have found that the unit cost which is really paid by the consumer at the other end of the line is best served by concentrating your ports in a central area where you can move in a brief span of time one to the other, without this long, 24-hour diversion.

Mr. EVINS. Carrying your argument to the logical conclusion, you would not develop any internal ports. You would be against developing the port of Houston, if you say you must take all the cargo to the seashore, and not have any internal channel development.

Mr. DEWEY. I have not studied Houston.

Mr. EVINS. Could it be that your opposition is partially based upon the fact that your shipping interests control major portions of the harbors existing now, and you do not wish to open competitive harbors to develop, or that others might come into it?

Mr. DEWEY. Could I assure you, sir, that our steamship companies run steamships. We are not in the business of running a port, in other words, a waterside terminal.

We may lease piers from the State of California on a 30-day lease—they can cancel it in 30 days, but we don't own those facilities, and if they make or lose we just pay the rent, and it is similar on the east side of the bay.

Mr. EVINS. By the patronage which you enjoy and the shipping which you largely control?

Mr. DEWEY. Certainly.

Mr. EVINS. You are not in favor of opening up any other port facilities?

Mr. DEWEY. That is very true. You have stated it very well, sir.

Mr. MURRAY. I just want a clarification on this. Is it not a fact that, under ordinary circumstances, a water transportation ship will go as far inland to the point of origin and distribution of its cargo as possible. Is not that an accurate statement?

Mr. DEWEY. Well, I don't believe so, sir. There is a tendency for the ships to go no further from the shore than they have to go to service the shipper. Now, a shipper or a group of shippers at an inland point may garner sufficient cargo to attract a ship to make a long inland haul to get it. An example is the port of Portland, Oreg., which is 90 miles from the coast. Right at the mouth of the Columbia River is the port of Astoria. But Astoria doesn't generate very much cargo. They used to have lumber and fish shipments, but at present they are not sufficient to make a huge merchant ship stop and pick up the few tons. The cargo is all at Portland, at the confluence of the Willamette and Columbia Rivers, at the confluence of a large trading hinterland. That is where the cargo is and that is where the ship goes. It would be costly for the ship to stop at Astoria, because there would be no cargo there. Yet that is the nearest port to the water. Their tendency will be to stay as close to the seaboard as possible, but they will go inland as far as they have to, to get a cargo that is offered.

Mr. MURRAY. In other words, is it not true that the prevailing circumstance is not to call at the seaboard, but wherever your business demands?

I know very little about the Sacramento area, but Chicago, where I reside, is a source of considerable transocean shipments. Certainly your ship line would, assuming it had enough business in Chicago, desire to pick up its goods in Chicago via water transportation rather than picking them up at, say, Los Angeles. Is that correct?

Mr. DEWEY. Where is the ship going?

Mr. MURRAY. Well, say it is going over to the Philippines.

Mr. DEWEY. And the cargo is in Chicago?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. DEWEY. You say that the merchant ship would prefer to pick it up in Chicago?

Mr. MURRAY. Is that true?

Mr. DEWEY. No, sir.

Mr. MURRAY. That is not an accurate statement?

Mr. DEWEY. No, sir; because at Chicago you have to go out the St. Lawrence. It is almost 6 days to New York from Chicago by water. When you get to New York, if you steam every single day, you have, it seems to me, without checking my table of distances, a 17- or 18-day steaming distance.

That probably wasn't a good example. I think I know what you mean.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a good example, I think. If I were to ship some cargo from Chicago to the Philippines, would it not be cheaper for me to ship it via Chicago on boat than it would by rail to your shipping point and then to the Philippines?

Mr. DEWEY. No, it would not. And we could make the same showing in Sacramento vis-a-vis the central ports. I could make the same argument on Sacramento that you have developed on Chicago. That is, that the land costs from Chicago or Sacramento to the shipping point at Los Angeles or San Francisco are less than moving the ship up and back to Sacramento or Chicago.

This is counter to what the Army Engineers say however. We say that is the crux of the controversy: Can you take the ship to the cargo cheaper than you can take the cargo to the ship?

Mr. EVINS. Are you in favor of the Stockton Port?

Mr. DEWEY. Stockton is a port and our ships are calling on inducement. Inducement is a tonnage sufficient to make a profit on the call. More and more of the companies in my association are calling at Stockton, but Stockton in the meantime has developed tremendous cargo which has made it attractive to go up there.

Mr. EVINS. You have no crystal ball. You cannot say that Sacramento will not develop more cargo?

Mr. DEWEY. Well, Stockton didn't cost $30 million, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. EVINS. You are for Stockton but against Sacramento? Is that the position that I judge you take?

Mr. DEWEY. I haven't checked the record but I have a sneaking hunch our people probably opposed Stockton too.

Mr. EVINS. Did your organization favor the development of the St Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. DEWEY. We did not.

Mr. EVINS. You are consistent there.

Mr. JENSEN. This deepening of this channel is a distance of 108 miles, you say?

Mr. DEWEY. The original river waterway is 108 miles, if they used the course of the river itself. That was the original plan, to use the river.

Since then, if I am not mistaken, all the appropriations to date have been upon the basis that they will dig a channel which will bypass roughly, two-third of the distance of the river. In other words, at a point about a third of the way up the river they branch off into what is known as Cache Slough, and connect with a series of small sloughs, and through roughly a straight line right through the marshes up to Lake Washington.

Mr. JENSEN. The new port would be in Sacramento?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes, but it is known as the West Sacramento Industrial Park.

Mr. JENSEN. Sacramento is the capital of California?

Mr. DEWEY. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. In other words, to put it down to where we could understand, we folks out in the middle of the United States do not have any problems like this. We have a dirt road to our town, but we want a paved road and so we go to the highway commission and say Now, we want you to build a State road so that the big trucks and everybody that wants to come in there can come in, and we can get more trade from the outlying areas. Before long, we have a concrete road running into our town, a nice paved road, and it helps our town. Now, that is a small example of what Sacramento wants, and, naturally, I can understand your position. You are a hired man of the shipping industry and we are hired men of Uncle Sam. We have to represent those folks there in Sacramento just as well as we represent you folks. So the thing we have to decide is whether we are going to run a route to Sacramento, to a very wonderful town with very fine people, in order to give them an outlet to the sea in which they can transport their commodities and people.

If you were sitting across the table from where you are sitting now, I wonder if you would not say: "Well now, we have to take a good look at this. We have to be fair to those people up there in Sacra-

mento." We don't like to spend money that is not necessary and is for a project that is not economically feasible. The only thing we can do is to take a good look at it and, if we finally decide that the people of Sacramento are entitled to this, I do not suppose we will give much consideration to whether or not it is going to mean another source of competition, because, after all, we have a problem of determining what is right and what is proper to appropriate the people's money for, but those folks up there want a road.

Mr. DEWEY. Right.

Mr. JENSEN. They want a road on which they can haul heavy traffic. They are asking for a waterway on which to haul heavy traffic to bring them closer to the rest of the world by water. Is that not right?

Mr. DEWEY. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. That is the thing we have to decide. That is all.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Dewey, I am interested in the question which the chairman originally asked you and which was pursued to some extent by the gentleman from Iowa. He said: "What was the real reason for your opposition here?" Your reply was that "Firstly, it is because we don't think that this project has been properly evaluated, and do not think it economically possible, especially now that it is a $30 million project instead of a $10 million project." But "firstly" was as far as you got. Either on or off the record, who are your principal competitors which might be served by this Sacramento development?

Mr. DEWEY. This is on the record?

Mr. HAND. On or off, as you prefer.

Mr. DEWEY. I prefer it on the record, Mr. Congressman. Will you ask the question again, please?

Mr. HAND. Who are the principal competitors who might be served by the development of the Sacramento Port?

Mr. DEWEY. All our companies would have it available to them.

Mr. HAND. Yet you do not want to use it? Who wants to use it?

Mr. DEWEY. Now, I would be getting into the economic arguments which cause us to raise some eyebrows about this thing.

Those who would use it would be principally tramp vessels which can afford to make a trip that far to get a partial or whole shipload of cargo; but the Army Engineers, or whoever gave the figures to the Army Engineers, it appears to me, have assumed that the berth vessels, those operating on fixed schedules, on fixed trade routes, will go to Sacramento for the same reasons that a tramp ship will, and to pick up as much cargo. They are proceeding on those assumptions, and ran the figures up and came out with a saving. Unfortunately their errors in assumptions have compounded themselves.

Mr. HAND. You say that their savings and benefit-cost ratio calculations have been premised on the assumption that your companies and others operating like your companies, will use these facilities, and you think they will not?

Mr. DEWEY. They tell me they will not, sir. Stockton is a good example. We have had it since 1932 and for many years deepwater vessels seldom used it. It was barge traffic. None of the big ships could afford to go there.

Mr. HAND. I am not out of sympathy with the suggestion you put forth that perhaps the evaluation of this project should at least be carefully studied, but I wanted to get at the real motive of your

clients, because, unfortunately, in this committee we very seldom have organizations or individuals who come here with the sole and pure idea of helping us to save money. I wish we did.

Mr. DEWEY. I think if I were to undertake that I would have to go a lot farther than the Sacramento project.

Mr. HAND. You finally wound up by being reasonably frank and saying that there is a competitive situation involved as well as what you think is an uneconomic situation.

Mr. DEWEY. There is no competitive situation in that there is nobody competing with us for Sacramento. There is a competitive situation between Sacramento and the other existing parts in the bay. To repeat, we have no financial interest in those ports. We have this interest, however: that the tolls, that the charges, that the assessments and the fees that we pay to these existing ports, out of which they amortize their investment, keep their facility in good shape, and so forth, we pay those fees and those tolls, and therefore we do not want to have the cargo diluted.

Mr. HAND. That is the point. You are fearing a loss of some of your cargo if this port is developed, is that right? That is what you meant by saying "diluted"?

Mr. DEWEY. That is right. Instead of 1,000 tons in the central part of the bay, there will be 500 here and you have to have 2 facilities and 2 managements. That is a dilution of your costs.

Mr. HAND. Thank you very much.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Dewey.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman has been very frank.

Mr. EVINS. It was a very fine statement.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955.

PROVO RIVER PROJECT AND WEBER BASIN PROJECT

WITNESSES

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF UTAH

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear next our colleague, Congressman Dawson of Utah. Do you want to present your colleagues?

Mr. DAWSON. We have Senator Watkins with us. He is anxious to get away. I think we should hear from him first.

At this point I would like to insert in the record a statement presented by Senator Bennett, who was here and who was forced to leave.

Mr. EVINS. The statement may be received.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT, OF UTAH

I am pleased to have the opportunity of appearing before this distinguished subcommittee to testify on two vital projects to the State of Utah:

DEER CREEK POWERPLANT

The first project is a proposed new 5,000-kilowatt capacity hydroelectric plant at the Deer Creek Dam on the Provo River reclamation project. The construction of the Provo River project was completed in 1941 and the Deer Creek Dam includes the necessary penstocks and powerhouse foundation for a powerplant. However, the additional hydroelectric facilities were not constructed pending an agreement between the Federal Government and the Provo River Water Users Association, the local contracting organization.

The local association has explored alternative construction possibilities with private capital but they have found it to be impractical. They have now reached an agreement with the Department of the Interior which was approved by Secretary McKay on April 22d of this year.

The powerplant, as approved by the Department of the Interior, was similarly approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the Federal Power Commission and the Corps of Engineers in 1951 and 1952, as shown in House Document No. 37 of the 83d Congress, 1st session.

It is vitally important that the powerplant be constructed as soon as possible. There is a serious water shortage in the area serviced by the Deer Creek project and the water supply of the Deer Creek diversion of the project is dependent in substantial measure upon a powerplant at the Deer Creek Dam. Most of the available water to the project comes from the Weber River and it is only the early spring runoff or floodwater which is available. However, the water year of 1953–54 produced no floodwater on the Weber River in excess of prior rights. It is only through a contract with the Utah Power & Light Co. that additional water from the Weber can be obtained.

Under the contract made in 1938, one-half of the winter power water above Echo Reservoir on the Weber River may be diverted to the Deer Creek Reservoir. But, the water must be paid for. The loss to the power company, due to taking the water away from its Weber River powerplants, must be made good by delivery to the power company of equivalent energy from a new powerplant at the Deer Creek Dam, or by delivery of water into the Provo River for use of a powerplant operated by the power company on that stream. Since there is no powerplant at Deer Creek, and since there is a recurring and serious water shortage, the only way the water can be obtained is for the water users to pay cash for the power water. They have paid $50,000 during this year alone and they are already heavily burdened in paying for the reclamation project itself. I am advised by the water users that they cannot continue to pay for the powerplant in view of their already extensive obligations.

The powerplant was planned in the original development, completed in 1941, to pay for the winter power water and to aid in paying for the project once the power phases were paid for.

The 13 years' delay has been costly to the water users and they are in a critical condition as a result of the present water shortages. I, therefore, urge this committee to appropriate the necessary $200,000 to begin construction of the powerplant this year.

The powerplant will pay out its estimated cost of $1,051,000 with interest in about 17 years, as well as pay for the Weber power water. It may also contribute as much as $4 million toward retirement of irrigation costs of the project.

WEBER BASIN PROJECT

I wish, also, to strongly urge that this committee approve the full $10,895,000 requested by the President for the Weber Basin project in fiscal year 1956.

The work on the project has proceeded with sufficient rapidity so that water can begin to be stored at the Wanship Dam by the spring of 1956, thus catching the spring runoff. Under the present schedule, water could be delivered in the summer of 1957 to Weber and Davis Counties, which are now suffering from a serious water shortage. However, this progress is contingent upon receiving the full appropriation.

Weber and Davis Counties have received a great portion of the nearly 30 percent growth in the State of Utah since 1940. The population of the two counties has expanded so rapidly that they have outgrown both their irrigation and

their municipal water supply. Fortunately, the Weber Basin project will provide some municipal water in addition to that furnished for irrigation.

The features of the project which will provide initial delivery of water are now underway. It is urgent that they be completed as rapidly as possible to provide water for several of our towns and cities now experiencing critical water shortages.

Mr. DAWSON. After Senator Watkins, I have a short statement to make.

PROVO RIVER PROJECT

Mr. EVINS. Senator Watkins, this committee is pleased to receive your testimony.

Senator WATKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. I thought I had appeared the last time for this particular project some time ago. This is the Provo River project.

Construction began back in 1936. It started out as a $15 million project and is now up to $20 million. It was not finished before the war. The war boom and inflation took place after that and raised the cost.

The appropriations that are sought are for the purpose of lining with clay a short canal about 9 or 10 miles in length. It is a rather inexpensive operation. Appropriations are also requested for the purpose of finishing the powerplant on the outlet from the dam that was constructed to store some waters of the Duchesne and Weber Rivers and from the Provo River.

The dam and reservoir are located in Provo Canyon at a place called Deer Creek.

The reason I am back is because we thought the thing was finished.

The powerplant was originally planned to be a part of the project. The repayment contract contained provisions with respect to it. The provisions were such that it could either be built by the Government or by the association with its own funds.

The association is the Provo River Water Users Association, the agency that represents all the water users in the area. It is an in-between unit between the Government and the water users.

I am personally acquainted with this entire matter because I was the attorney for some 14 years for this project, from the time it was organized until it was nearly finished. We finished everything but the powerplant. The penstocks are in. The potential power has been going to waste for years. There was a time when the association thought that it could build the power end of it on its own resources. It did not have anything in the nature of real estate that was in its own name. The project under the reclamation program does not have title in the name of the association, but it is still in the United States Government.

They thought they had an opportunity to finance it themselves. They found it very impractical, in fact almost impossible to do so so that it would be of help to the project. So we are back here now asking for money which at one time was in the bill, had been approved by the Senate committee and was, in fact, in the printer's hands. I had to get Senator Hayden out of bed one night to get it out of the Senate bill, because they thought they could go ahead and finance this contract themselves.

The repayment contract contains this provision with respect to power, section 38 (a), Power Development:

Either the United States or the association, with the approval of the Secretary, may develop the power possibilities, on the project provided such development does not impair the yield of water from the project, nor interfere with the operations thereof for the primary purpose of utilizing the developed water supply of the projects, irrigation, municipal, domestic, and industrial purposes, other than power.

The association shall at all times have the right to use for the project purpose so much of the power produced as may be so required.

(b) Application of profits from power development and other operations.

Net income from the sale of surplus power or water, being power not utilized for project purposes, and water other than water to which the shareholders shall be entitled as determined by the Secretary, shall upon collection, be remitted to the United States for application on construction charges due or to become due, without regard, unless otherwise directed by law, to any development legislation pertaining to such construction charges until all obligations of the association to the United States shall have been liquidated. After all payments have been made as above provided, the net power revenues shall (1) belong to the association, in case the association develops the power possibilities at its own expense; (2) disposed of as Congress shall direct, in case the power possibilities are developed by the United States or with funds advanced by the United States * * *.

Mr. EVINS. May I interrupt? The association has declined to develop the power?

Senator WATKINS. Well, they find that they cannot. You see, in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, after the dams and everything were finished so that they could go ahead, they applied to the Secretary, Secretary Chapman at the time, for permission to go ahead and construct it themselves on their own resources, and he declined, and it was only after the new administration came into power a little over a year ago that they were given permission to go ahead with it.

At that time the situation had changed and they were not in a position to finance it. Now they are back here.

Mr. EVINS. I understand that even with a new administration and a new Secretary, the association does not wish to proceed with the building of the powerplant. They want the Government to build it?

Senator WATKINS. They have run into difficulties; that is right.

The title to the dam and everything is in the name of the United States and will be after the project is paid off.

Mr. EVINS. We are proceeding on the same common basis that the Government should do for the people things which they cannot do for themselves?

Senator WATKINS. That is right. Our—or rather, my own personal judgment was that they should have gone ahead under Mr. Chapman because, as I say, I understood that they wanted the United States to go ahead, sought the appropriation, and obtained it. It was in the Senate bill and I think the House would have accepted it at that time.

Mr. EVINS. Did you represent the association initially?

Senator WATKINS. Yes, I organized it. I started it from the very beginning and was with it for 14 years.

Mr. EVINS. Was the initial plan for the association to develop the power?

Senator WATKINS. There was no initial plan to do it either way. We wanted to leave it open so that we could do it if we were able to do so.

Mr. EVINS. Now, after all these years, it concluded that this is a project that the Government should handle, for the production of power and that the Government should proceed at this stage and develop the power for the people's use?

Senator WATKINS. That is right, because you have a situation now where you would have the Government in practically better than nine-tenths of the operation and would have to have some other outfit in there running the power.

Mr. EVINS. Senator, how much was requested in the budget originally for this purpose?

Senator WATKINS. I cannot answer that because I have not before me the figures that came in.

Mr. EVINS. How much are you requesting to be in this bill?

Senator WATKINS. Whatever Mr. Larsen, for the Bureau of Reclamation recommended here the other day. I think it is around $200,000.

Mr. DAWSON. I think I can answer that.

Senator WATKINS. The project, as I understand it, is in a rather advanced stage of construction. It is finished except for this. The penstocks are in.

Mr. EVINS. This is a similar situation to the Roza project?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, they have advanced further on this. I would say it was similar, to some degree, except that, of course, they cannot buy power on the project for about 2 mills a kilowatt. You have to pay possibly 7 or 8?

Senator WATKINS. It will cost above 6, I think.

Mr. EVINS. I want to state what I have said earlier, that in my visits to the West it has impressed me that people there need water and power.

I am for those projects which develop the internal section of our country.

Senator WATKINS. I am glad to hear that because you and I think alike on that, and I am sure that probably all the members of the committee do.

Mr. JENSEN. The Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations have not done too bad a job on appropriating money for such things.

Senator WATKINS. You have done well. As I say, the money had been put in the bill, and over on the Senate side, in this very act.

There is another thing connected with the use of this powerplant that is important. That is, the dam. The Deer Creek Reservoir is on the Provo River. We bring water from another watershed, the Weber River.

In order to get the water during the winter when it is not used for irrigation, to store in the dam, we had to make an arrangement with the Utah Power & Light which owned the powerplant above Ogden, Utah. They have the right under Utah law to have that water come to serve their powerplant.

We said, "Let us take that water in the wintertime and you close your plant down. Let us take that water over and store it in the dam. We will put in this powerplant at this dam and give you back an equivalent in power, because we will run that water through the penstocks and over the wheels, and give you an exchange of power."

They were willing to do it.

We ought to put in this plant. We have had some bad droughts out there in the past 2 or 3 years, and have had to pay them for the water and bring it over and store it because we did not have any means of giving them the power in exchange.

We will save a lot of money if we can put in these wheels and generators right away and go to work and produce the power.

We have lost, in my opinion, nearly one-quarter of a million dollars already.

We are not blaming the Government for that because, as I say, at one time they were all ready to give them the money. The people there had an idea that they could to it themselves. Mr. Chapman opposed them for a long time and finally, when they did get the approval they found that they could not do it. That is the way the situation stands.

Mr. EVINS. Providing some competition in the power field might be a good thing for the people of your area.

Senator WATKINS. It is a very small amount of power. It is not a large powerplant and it is not what we could call consistently firm power. There is very little firm power in it. Most of it comes at the time when we release the water during the summer season for irrigation purposes.

Mr. EVINS. If it is a small amount, Senator, is it economically feasible to go ahead and do the job?

Senator WATKINS. Yes, because we can more than pay it back. This is one project of which I think if all others failed in the United States, this would pay us, because we have Salt Lake and Provo and all the municipalities and all the farmers, in one of the richest parts of the United States.

Mr. EVINS. The others are not failing.

Senator WATKINS. No, but I say this is in the blue ribbon class. If it cannot pay you would not have any of them pay.

Mr. EVINS. Senator, you make a very convincing statement for marginal power production, and I commend you.

Senator WATKINS. This is incidental. It is only two million or three million dollars out of some twenty-odd-million dollars.

The lining of the canal is the other item. That canal runs from the Weber River around the mountainside over into the Provo and winds around over the divide between the two rivers.

I have had personal experience with this one. I was not only the attorney but, in fact, a manager of the project from the time it started until I came back to Congress. We were losing a lot of water through porous areas, through a gravel area. Water was getting away and we were having law suits from the farmers below.

We hit on the scheme of hauling in clay and dumping it in the canal and letting the canal take it down and fill the pores of this area with the clay. That worked all right for many of the bad spots, but we did not finish the job. We tightened it up at the spots that were leaking the worst. And we have some more leaks occurring in other spots and they want to finish that job. That is a very cheap lining job.

WEBER BASIN PROJECT

I want to talk about the Weber Basin project. You are acquainted with that. It is well under construction now.

The budget as I recall, calls for $10,800,000.

We do hope that on this project the two small powerplants which are incidental to its construction and operation will be approved by the committee. There is little power, if and when these plants are constructed, to be sold to the public. It will be used largely in pumping operations in connection with the project itself.

I think one of the private utility companies probably filed a formal request not to include those two powerplants in the program, but they are in the program and they were planned to be a part, to make it feasible all the way around and to make it operate better.

It would be a shame to let the power that has developed there go to waste over the years when for a small additional appropriation it can take care of some of the needs of the project in the pumping of water to make all of its features operate successfully.

I do not know whether that is a burning issue right now with them, but we certainly hope that this committee will approve the request to have those plants included. They are in the original plans. The original report was approved in the Weber Basin bill by both Houses, the Senate on the Unanimous Consent Calendar and in the House, the three-fourths rule.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there a request for funds on those powerplant items in the budget this year?

Mr. DAWSON. They were disapproved by the Bureau of the Budget. That is one of the issues coming up in regard to the partnership agreement. The whole appropriation was allowed with the exception of the two powerplants. They were disapproved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Senator WATKINS. I want to point out that this program was approved and the project was approved with the plants an essential part of it during the Truman administration.

APPROVAL OF POWERPLANT ON PROVO RIVER PROJECT

Mr. EVINS. I will say that we have a press release from the Department of the Interior, dated April 22d, which states:

> Approval of Federal construction of a 5,000 kilowatt capacity hydroelectric plant at Deer Creek Dam on the Provo River reclamation project in Utah was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

It goes on to say:

> On March 9, 1955, Fisher Harris, general counsel for the Provo River Eaters Users Association, advised the Department of the Interior of the Association's decision to abandon its proposed plans for construction of the plant and requested that it be undertaken by the United States.

It will be placed in the record at this time.

(The information referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INFORMATION SERVICE

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION OF DEER CREEK, UTAH, HYDROELECTRIC PLANT APPROVED

Approval of Federal construction of a 5,000-kilowatt capacity hydroelectric plant at Deer Creek Dam on the Provo River reclamation project in Utah was announced today by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

The action followed a request by the Provo River Water Users Association that the powerplant and associated facilities be constructed by the United States. The association is the local contracting entity for repayment to the Government of the cost of the Provo River reclamation project.

The repayment contract which was signed in 1936 provided that the proposed powerplant could be built by either the United States or the association. Deer Creek Dam was completed in 1941. It included penstocks and powerhouse foundation but other work on the hydroelectric facilities was not undertaken pending an agreement between the Government and the water users association.

On October 16, 1953, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Fred C. Aandahl notified the association of conditions under which the Government would be agreeable to the association proceeding with construction.

On March 9, 1955, Fisher Harris, general counsel for the Provo River Water Users Association, advised the Department of the Interior of the association's decision to abandon its proposed plans for construction of the plant and requested that it be undertaken by the United States.

Secretary McKay approved this proposal and indicated that the Department of the Interior is willing to go ahead with construction as soon as funds are appropriated by the Congress and also contingent upon a further contract with the water users which would provide for operation of the powerplant and the Deer Creek Dam by the water users' association and that power revenues be applied to retirement of construction costs.

The hykroelectric plant is estimated to pay out its estimated cost of $1,051,000 with interest in about 17 years, as well as make up energy losses at private utility plants on Weber River from which water is diverted in Deer Creek Reservoir. The plant may also contribute as much as $4 million toward retirement of the irrigation costs of the project.

Mr. EVINS. It appears that the association, as the Senator indicated, has abandoned their plan, and that the Secretary has approved that the Government will go ahead, depending upon the appropriation.

Senator WATKINS. That is all I have to say, and I think, in spite of the fact that the Bureau of the Budget did not approve these two powerplants on the Weber River project, that they ought to be approved. There is just as strong a reason for them being in there as there is for the Provo River project.

I had a formal statement but I do not think I will file it now. I lived with this for so many years that I thought it would be a poor situation if I could not explain it.

Mr. EVINS. You made a persuasive statement, Senator.

Mr. Dawson, do you wish to make your statement at this point?

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement which I would like to leave for the record.

Mr. EVINS. The statement may be filed for the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank members of the committee for giving me this opportunity of appearing on behalf of the continued orderly construction of two reclamation projects in the state of Utah.

These projects are the Weber Basin project and the Provo River project.

I have been informed that the Department of Interior has requested $10.8 million for continued construction of the Weber Basin project and that this amount has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget for submission to your committee. I strongly urge members of the committee to approve this appropriation. The continued orderly construction of this project is vital to our State and to the Nation. The water is needed today and the Nation's investment in this project cannot be repaid until it is in operation

The second request I have to make is for an appropriation of $200,000 to begin the installation of a 5,000 kilowatt capacity hydroelectric plant at Deer Creek Dam, a key structure of the Provo River reclamation project. The proposal to have the Bureau of Reclamation construct this powerplant has the approval of Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay but through no fault of the Department this approval was not forthcoming in time for the Department to request funds of this committee. It will therefore be necessary for the committee to add this $200,000 request to the bill now before you.

It is impossible to overemphasize the importance of this appropriation to the project sponsors and to the Government which is now being repaid for the cost of this project. It is estimated that the overall cost of the powerplant of $1,051,000 will be repaid with interest in about 17 years and is expected to contribute as much as $4 million toward retirement of the irrigation costs of the project.

If the committee will bear with me I shall attempt to show why the immediate construction of this powerplant is necessary if the United States is to protect its investment in the entire project. Construction of this project was begun in 1938

but due to the intervention of the war the irrigation and municipal water features were not completed until 1952. Meanwhile, estimated cost at the time construction was undertaken increased from $9.9 million to $33.3 million. This increase in cost had to be borne by the project sponsors and the repayment program bears heavy upon them. Nevertheless, repayments have been made on time and the Government has not suffered from the increased cost of the project.

At first it was felt by sponsors of the project that it would be better if they—rather than the Government—installed the power-generating facilities at Deer Creek Dam. The penstocks and spillways are part of the original project. All that is needed are generators.

This method of financing the project however became unfeasible when a series of seasons of short water supply occurred. In order for the project to meet its commitments to irrigation and municipal subscribers, it has become necessary for it to tap winter power water used by the Utah Power & Light Co. The power company under the terms of the contract is entitled to either be paid for this loss of generating power in cash or have its lost power replaced by the project sponsors.

Without generating power at Deer Creek, the sponsors of the project have no choice but to pay the utility for the loss of generating power when it becomes necessary to take the company's winter power water. This adds a heavy and unnecessary financial burden to the repayment burden already assumed. If the powerplant were in, however, the power company could be repaid in kind for loss of electricity. In addition to covering this debt, revenues from sale of electricity would bring in sufficient additional revenue to pay for the plant in 17 years and—after that period—contribute some $75,000 annually toward repayment of the municipal and irrigation features.

The sponsors of this project have pledged their property to repay the Government. In order for the Government to protect its investment and keep faith with the people, this powerplant must be built.

Funds were made available by Congress for this purpose, but approval was withheld while the sponsors of the project investigated other methods of financing it. Now, all are in agreement that this method would be to the advantage of the Government and to those who are pledged to repay its cost with interest.

I strongly urge the inclusion of $200,000 in the budget in order that this power can be generated.

Mr. DAWSON. I would like also to comment on some of the features that Senator Watkins has discussed.

WEBER BASIN PROJECT

I appear on behalf of the two projects. The first is the one that Senator Watkins mentioned last, the Weber Basin project.

The amount requested by the Department, less the 2 powerhouses, is $10.8 million. That provides for continued orderly construction of this project.

The project is moving along in good shape and I might state that Mr. Jensen will be particularly interested in the fact that it is being constructed for considerably under the amount estimated by the Interior Department, all the way along the line.

All the bids are under, which is rather encouraging.

I am not going to make a point of the two powerhouses. The Senator has done that, and I am willing to leave that to the committee. My hope is that sometime we might work out an agreement there between the Utah Power & Light Co. and the Weber Basin people as to who is to build the powerhouse, but until it is done, I am willing to leave the matter where it is, as far as I am concerned.

So much for the Weber Basin project. I think there is no dispute on it. It has been approved all along the line. We urge you to keep that in your appropriations' measure.

PROVO RIVER PROJECT

As to the second project, the Provo River project, the amount which has been requested by the district office is $200,000 to begin the construction of this powerhouse. I might state to the committee that it is not in the request to the Department for the reason that the decision was not recommended out there soon enough for the region to get it in here and have the request made.

However, the Department has now approved it, as indicated by the press release and Mr. E. O. Larsen, the regional director of regions, who appeared before your committee last week left a statement here in which he urged the inclusion of that amount in the budget.

I hope that it can be included.

The reasons for it were explained by Senator Watkins. I would like to add a few more statements that he did not include. This powerhouse will pay itself out in 17 years, with interest. It will fully pay for itself and then start turning funds over to help pay for the other features of the project as it was originally intended in the contract that was made with the water users. The total cost of the powerplant will be $1,051,000. It will be repaid over a period of 17 years, with interest, and is then expected to pay as much as $4 million for the retirement of the irrigation costs of the project.

Now, Senator Watkins has explained to you the reasons why it is urgent.

The Utah Power & Light Co. owns the water rights on the Provo River and on the Weber River covering water which empties into the Deer Creek Reservoir. In order to repay them for the waters which go into this reservoir they are required to either get an equivalent amount of water from some other source or else to repay them from power, substitute power for power taken away, for the water of which they are deprived. The only way they can do that is to go ahead and construct this powerplant.

As the Senator told you, the penstocks are already in. The only thing that would be required would be the construction of the framework for the building and putting in the generators. You could then immediately start producing power. The power would be sold or transferred to the Utah Power & Light Co. to repay it for the water which goes over the dam to operate the turbines.

We have no public power out there at all in the State of Utah, with the exception of a few municipally owned steam generating powerplants, and two very small co-ops down in the southern part of the State which are nowhere near this project.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that that concludes my statement unless you have some questions.

Mr. EVINS. Can it be understood and agreed that the power produced will be taken by the Utah Power & Light Co. and sold, and that they are to accept it?

Mr. DAWSON. It will be sold at the bus bar. There are no plans for any transmission lines.

Mr. EVINS. But they are to take the power for the cost of the water?

Mr. DAWSON. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. They already have a contract to that effect. The fact is that they must be repaid and if the power is generated they will take the power.

Thank you, Mr. Dawson, for your fine statement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Dawson, I am happy that you came before the committee and made your fine statement.

Mr. DAWSON. I want to say that we appreciate what has been done by the committee, with which Congressman Jensen has been associated, and we are happy to appear before your committee, which has now assumed those functions. We hope that from time to time we can acquaint you with some of our pressing problems out there.

We hope that you will take the opportunity some time of going out and seeing what water means to us in that part of country.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you.

Mr. DAWSON. Congressman Dixon is here and I think he wants to make a very short statement.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Dixon, the committee will be pleased to receive your testimony.

Mr. DIXON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I shall be very brief. I would like to say that I am in full accord with what Senator Watkins and Senator Bennett have said at this hearing, and what Representative Dawson has said with regard to the Weber Basin and Provo River projects.

WEBER BASIN PROJECT

The Weber project is partly in my district and partly in Representative Dawson's district.

I am happy to report that the management has been excellent and that they have received contracts for considerably less money than the first estimates. I think that that is unusual.

They are saving a great deal of money and at the same time they are pushing the project. It is way ahead of schedule.

This program will transform industrial, agricultural, and population outlook for Brigham City, Willard, Ogden, South Ogden, Roy, Clearfield, Kaysville, and Bountiful, which communities are directly dependent upon the project for any further expansion.

For years I have followed the struggles of these various city, town, and county officials to secure enough water to sustain life and afford some growth. This project is their great hope and the reward for their commendable efforts.

Because of the great defense industries at Hill Field, at Clearfield, at Second Street and the Ogden Arsenal, there has been a great influx of people. Davis County is the second fastest growing county and Weber is the third or fourth fastest growing county in Utah. As I recall it, in Weber and Davis and Box Elder Counties, before the depots were built, we had 19,000 gainfully employed. You will be interested to know that these depots alone hired more than 19,000 people during the war and that they employ fully half that number now.

The depots, the employees of the depots, and the citizens along a stretch of 50 miles of the Wasatch front are destitute for water. The drought last summer took the water pressure out of hundreds of homes during certain hours, dried up lawns, destroyed crops, and subjected the area to serious fire hazard.

The situation is so acute that we must push the project as rapidly as we can.

I am happy to tell you how favorably and rapidly the project is going, and I am glad to hear your encouraging comments about it.

My thanks to you for this opportunity to appear in its behalf, as well as on behalf of the Deer Creek project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Dixon.

Mr. JENSEN. We are glad to have Mr. Dixon present. This is the first time I have ever heard you testify before a committee, and I think you did a very nice job.

Mr. DIXON. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. JENSEN. I have been interested in this project for about 10 years. I remember the first time that this project was brought to our attention. It was quite an undertaking for those people out there to obligate themselves to all this money that they had to pay back sooner or later, over a period of years, but they came in, and many of them were here and they were all united. I never saw a people more united on a project than were the people in the Weber project area. I am just happy to know that it is coming along so well, and, of course, it will be finished.

Mr. DIXON. They critically need it. They have a great leader out there who was the secretary of the Ogden Chamber of Commerce when I was president. He is really a human engineer. He has helped to unite all those towns and they are working together as a great team. It is their interest and their unity that is pushing the project so fast and getting such favorable results. That leader is Ezra Fjeldsted.

Mr. DAWSON. I want to affirm what Mr. Jensen has said about the people out there cooperating in repaying on the Weber Basin project.

They have formed a conservation district out there, of course, and are levying assessments on all land in the area, regardless of whether they use water or not. It is a general assessment to help pay for this project, in addition, of course, to the water that is sold.

That is something, of course, that is a little different than some projects, because they are actually pledging all their assets to pay for it.

PROVO RIVER PROJECT

On the Provo River project the record is just as good. As Senator Watkins testified, the original cost of the Provo project, if I recall, was about $9 million. Then the war came along. They were lagging in construction and Senator Watkins says that the cost went to $20 million. Actually it went from $9 million to $33 million on this project.

The people came in and signed a new contract, pleading themselves to pay the $33 million, and entered into a conservancy-type contract.

In addition, Salt Lake City had a metropolitan water district enter into a contract to pledge the credit of the city to pay for this water.

So, it is not costing the Government a penny, and they are paying it all back and pledging their property to do it.

Mr. DIXON. Isn't the Deer Creek project quite largely responsible for the great industrial growth of Salt Lake City in recent years?

Mr. DAWSON. It is. When the United States Steel took over the Geneva Steel plant there, they had to rely upon the water for the operation of that plant.

There was objection from Mr. Kirwan and others, who come from steel areas, that maybe the Government was entering into a picture to subsidize private industry.

The fact of the matter is now that the steel plant gets none of that water. They have their own water supply and it is all going into the

uses for which it was originally intended. That is not in the picture at all.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Dawson, and thank you, Mr. Dixon.

Mr. DAWSON. We appreciate your courtesy.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1955.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA

CENTINELA FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

WITNESS

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, A MEMBER IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Roosevelt, I believe you have a project you want to discuss with us.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the committee is already somewhat familiar with this project. This is part of the overall Los Angeles County drainage area problem and this particular project which has to do with my district is called the Centinela flood-control project. It is separate except, in area, it is about the same as the other project. It is this part of the project [indicating on map].

I think you have already heard testimony on those upper things, and this is one that comes in there [indicating on map].

My interest in this thing is to explain to the committee there has been a very great controversy within the district as to the route that this channel should take; because, again, it comes into Mr. Hughes' property and he is very strongly opposed to having any hazard created to his runway.

Mr. JENSEN. Who is Mr. Hughes?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Howard Hughes, of the Hughes Aircraft Co., whose plant is located right in this area. And he is strongly opposed to the present route selected by the Corps of Engineers and, together with the flood control district whose job it will be to condemn and make available the land, he has pointed out that he feels the present project is dangerous because it is an open ditch that runs right alongside of his runway. It has been proposed that that portion of the ditch be covered, but the Army engineers have pointed out that boosts the cost tremendously and they do not feel it is necessary to do it.

An alternative program which Mr. Hughes favors goes up over there to the north and cuts through the heart of a new residential area, and all the residents of the area, naturally, are up in arms because it would affect all of their property values, which were very recently acquired. The second thing is it would create a hazard to have an open ditch go right through an area where there is a large population of young children.

Mr. Hughes, under an agreement with the Army engineers and the county flood control district, is now spending a very large amount of money on his own private survey to try to counteract the Army engineers' survey.

The project is badly needed and I brought over just some of the letters that have come in to me regarding the flood conditions that resulted in this past year and the damage that has occurred and, incidentally, it does have a very serious effect on the production of the Hughes Aircraft Co., because a great many people cannot get to work during the floodtime. I think that testimony is already in.

Now the Army engineers are asking for additional funds for planning this year, I believe, in the amount of $180,000. I feel very strongly that I would like to suggest there is a possibility, I think, that the county would be willing to advance the funds to cover that portion of the drainage ditch that goes adjacent to the Hughes' property and perhaps it would be well to let some time go by before we appropriate any more money which would preclude this final negotiation being considered and wound up. And my own personal feeling is, while I know the urgency of it, that simply to put more money on the planning hook when, in my opinion, it cannot be used until such time as this decision is finally made as to where the route is to be, is just giving the Corps of Engineers more money perhaps to use as a pressure which is unfair. I am afraid it might result, because of the pressure of the Hughes people, in the Army engineers finally giving up because they had planning money and would feel they were under obligation to you to proceed with the project, and they might offer at last to go up through the other area.

I have been told they are using as an argument that the city is going to build a road down to where the residential area is, a sort of freeway down into the same harbor area we have been discussing. I have examined into that very carefully and that can happen some time, but it is a very far distant thing and one that is surrounded by all kinds of ifs, ands, and buts and would delay it until the people of the area would suffer a continued serious loss of millions of dollars, and loss of life.

So I would like to suggest that the committee examine very carefully the need for additional funds by the Corps of Engineers until such time as this final routing is decided. I believe if you will wait for this decision, perhaps you will find next year that we will come back with an agreement by all parties, with the county taking over the covering of that area and eliminating, I think, a wrong decision to go up through the residential area. So I respectfully request that you examine that particular appropriation. I would be glad to have it withdrawn for this year, if it can be done without prejudice to the project for next year. I do not know, frankly, about the working in this committee, if we took this out, had it withdrawn, for this year under these circumstances, whether it will jeopardize the completion of the project next year. I hope it would not and, if it would not, then I would like to suggest that it would be proper to save the appropriation this year.

Mr. EVINS. The Corps of Engineers is proposing to build the drainage ditch along the main boulevard and leave it open?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Right on the side of it; yes, sir.

Mr. EVINS. This map shows Jefferson Boulevard, a thoroughfare, with the proposed drainage ditch along either side of the boulevard and crossing one side of the boulevard, and they propose to leave the drainage ditch open?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct, and the runway is right on the lower side. The Hughes' property is on the south side of the boulevard.

Mr. EVINS. Then it would not only be unsightly, but would be hazardous?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In my opinion, it would. I think it should be covered in that area. It is hazardous without covering it. Roughly, it is a little more than half a mile and I think it should be covered.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. EVINS. This is all in your district, is it not?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is all in my district.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you for your testimony and your very fine and able presentation.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

COLUMBIA RIVER BAR PROJECT

WITNESSES

HON. WALTER NORBLAD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

ARTHUR D. FARMER, GENERAL MANAGER, PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

RALPH B. DEWEY, PACIFIC AMERICAN STEAMSHIP CO.

ROBERT F. DONOGHUE, PACIFIC AMERICAN TANKSHIP ASSOCIATION

Mr. EVINS. The western section of the Appropriations Subcommittee will hear this morning a number of our colleagues, Members of Congress, and witnesses that have come here from elsewhere on projects on the west coast. First, we are going to hear our colleague, Mr. Walter Norblad. We will be very pleased to hear Mr. Norblad, a very fine Congressman and an able representative.

Mr. NORBLAD. On behalf of both myself and the several witnesses here today to testify on the Columbia River bar project, I wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity to present our case.

I wish to make a very brief opening statement and then present those from the shipping industry who can go into more detail regarding this very urgently needed appropriation.

First, let me say that the Columbia River is 1 of the 4 major ports on the Pacific coast—the others being the harbors of Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle-Tacoma.

Presently, we have a 40-foot bar there but the need is for a 48-foot bar for several reasons.

A 40-foot bar may on the face of it seem adequate until it is realized that the mouth of the Columbia has a peculiar situation unto itself wherein, because of weather and large ground swells, there is a very high rise and fall in the water level. Accordingly, the 40-foot figure is one which would obtain in periods of maximum good weather and calm but means little when these swells are prevalent or there is bad weather. The depth of the bar at such times is way below the 40-foot level and the 48-foot bar is needed to compensate for this factor.

Several groundings have occurred in recent years and presently larger ships either enter the river only partially loaded or stand outside awaiting good weather conditions before entering.

A 40-foot bar was adequate 30 years ago but because of the increase in the size of present ships that is no longer the case. In 1925, the average net tonnage of ships entering the river was 2,400 tons and it is now over 4,500 tons, an increase of 85 percent.

Thirty years ago, 70 ships of a draft of 28 feet or more entered the Columbia while currently more than 800 ships 28-foot draft or more are entering the river. Our bar pilots who are in a position to know say that passage for ships of 28 or more foot draft is very hazardous particularly if the weather is stormy.

These are some of the principal reasons for the current project.

I will now present others who will elaborate on our urgent need for this project.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be glad to hear Mr. Mack who has been before this committee before and has expressed great interest in this project.

Mr. MACK. When I was here the other day, Mr. Chairman, I spoke about an emergency project in the Pacific Northwest and said I would be back with a group of witnesses later to discuss this Columbia project. This project, an $8,500,000 one, was authorized by the last session of the Congress. This came about as the result of bills introduced by Mr. Angell and myself proposing this project. It was approved by the Army engineers, by the Budget Bureau, and by the Congress of the United States and thereby authorized.

The Columbia River bar carries the second largest amount of traffic of any port on the Pacific coast, only being exceeded by Los Angeles Harbor. Traffic on this river includes the importation of raw materials for the aluminum plants—alumina—a very bulky project, supplies for the pulp and paper mills. Exports include a great deal of the cargo lumber shipments of both the States of Oregon and Washington, a great deal of pulp and paper, pig aluminum and, in recent years, there has been a tremendous cargo grain business developed because the river route provides a down grade from eastern Washington and Idaho into Portland, Vancouver, and Longview. On the Oregon side the project will serve such port cities as Astoria and Portland and a number of lesser ports. On the Washington side of the river it will serve the major ports of Longview and Vancouver and also a group of smaller ones such as Kalama and Ilwaco.

I join with our colleague, Mr. Norblad, in urging that some kind of a start be made on this project this year in the hope that it will be completed in the next 2 or 3 years.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Mack, and also Mr. Norblad.

Mr. NORBLAD. I would like to present Mr. Arthur Farmer, the manager of the Portland Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. EVINS. We will be pleased to hear from Mr. Farmer.

Mr. FARMER. Gentlemen, today I represent the port of Portland, the port of Longview, and the port of Astoria, and the chambers of commerce of those cities. Those people have had representatives to form a committee because of the critical condition at the mouth of the Columbia River.

Our commerce started in 1850 with one cargo going to Hong Kong and one going to England in the same year and grew to considerable size. In the 1880's it appeared that the Columbia River which at that time had three 21-foot channels coming in had to be stabilized if commerce was to be saved. So, by successive acts of Congress a 7-mile jetty was put out to the south of the river and a 2-mile jetty on the north of the river leaving a funnel of 2 miles. We had a 48-foot channel. Now, experience has shown that that channel has sloughed away—200 feet at the base; 20 feet at the top. It sloughed away and has been repaired, with a total expenditure of $22 million.

The south sands have been shifting into the river. Whereas you had 48 feet right up the center of the channel, now you have 40 and it is getting shallower. Against the north jetty, you have 70 feet; right inside the bar you have 70 feet. Out at the ocean you have plenty, so you have a bottleneck there at one point.

At the turn of the century a million tons developed. Now, last year 9 million tons developed. Ships are getting deeper, heavier draft, deeper draft. Ten years ago, we had 150 ships with over 28-foot draft. In 1950, we had 800 ships. Last year, a few more over 30-foot draft.

Now, the seas come in there pounding 25-foot waves, maximum 30-foot. There is only one place I know of that can do that. It is coming into the Columbia River. The sound is open, the bay is open; but here this heavy tonnage port, second on the Pacific coast, unfortunately has these heavy pounding waves and they are not stopping. The waves continue. Ten days we had 20-foot waves. Shipping stopped, at sea or in the river, with consequent rather heavy loss.

The effect has been this: either you stay outside the bar or in the river. You load your ships light, and we are doing this now, at port where the 10 billion feet of lumber originates, heavy cargo such as grain, and about 5—I should say 5 million tons of oil coming in.

So our problem is at a time when our traffic is at its heaviest and growing heavier. The engineers estimate for the next few years it will be 12 million tons a year. Our channel is getting shallower and it is paying—the Congress has spent in that area a total of $45 million. Transportation savings each year are $15 million, a 33-percent return. I think your average request insisted upon is probably 4 percent. You are getting your money back on that channel, all the money you spend there, every third year. Now, we need a total of $8½ million. But this year there has been nothing recommended. We do not know why, whether it was omission, whether it was change of Congressmen in the Third District, our district, or our fault, whether it was omission of the Bureau of the Budget, but while these waves are pounding now and we are loading light, and we are losing ships and we are paying heavily for damages to ships, because there is a squat, 3 feet, on top of your 30-foot loading; when you get a 20-foot sea you cannot go in but they go on a 10- or 15-foot sea and there have been stern frames broken; there have been rudders lost. Only one ship has been lost in the past few years, totally lost and swept to sea. Small boats have been lost and lives lost, of course.

Now we want to say that at a very low cost it can be stopped. It must be done. It has to be done. The question is timing. This project has been approved all the way down the line. District engineers,

division engineer, chief, by committees of Congress, by the States of Oregon and Washington and the Interior Department and everyone. It comes to the point now: Can the Government afford to spend it or can afford not to spend it. You own half of it. You are the board of directors for half the State. You own 53 percent of it. You are taking $75 million out of our forests this year that goes into the Federal Treasury. Aside from the tax loss of that $53 million we could maintain our own channel if you give us permission to.

Of course, it is probably ridiculous to ask, but if you give us our money from our own industries we will maintain our own channel, but barring that we ask you this year to correct the omission made by someone, whether in the Engineer Corps or in the Bureau of the Budget—we know it is unusual; we know it is not done; we know also that lives are going to be lost and damage done there unless this is going to be done and we have only until October to do the dredging that we can do this year. We hope for the heavy money next year, but we hope that sincerely that you will appropriate a little under $1 million, probably $900,000 which will permit heavy dredging next year.

Thank you very much.

Mr. EVINS. Your prepared statement will be received as though read.

Mr. FARMER. Thank you, sir.

I represent here that organization and the port of Portland, port of Vancouver, Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, port of Longview, the Longview Chamber of Commerce, port of Astoria, and Astoria Chamber of Commerce.

Those public and private organizations have formed a committee to concern themselves with the deterioration of shipping conditions at the mouth of the Columbia River.

The first record of the condition of the river at the mouth of the Columbia River was the sounding chart made by Captain Vancouver in 1792. The Vancouver chart shows three shifting channels leading from the estuary of the Columbia River into the open sea. These had a controlling depth of 21 feet. The intermittent ship traffic carried on up to 1850 obviously suffered severe navigation conditions, particularly since that channel shifted location after each storm season.

Shipping started in earnest from the Columbia River in 1850 when a cargo of lumber was shipped to Hong Kong and a cargo of grain to the British Isles in the same year.

This was immediately after the United States definitely acquired ownership of the Northwest Pacific area south of the 49th parallel.

Shipping increased until it became necessary that the river entrance and the channel upriver be improved to accommodate ships of growing size.

Your predecessors in Congress ordered a survey in the 1880's: the survey resulted in the first construction of the south jetty. The river entrance had become sufficiently stabilized to permit almost 1 million tons of cargo in and out of the Columbia by the turn of the century.

The jetty construction was completed in 1918 with a 7-mile south jetty, a 2-mile north jetty, and a channel in the entrance area 48 feet of depth. Subsequently, the channel of Portland was deepened to

35 feet and cargo traffic has grown to 9 million tons in the past year, with 3,000 ships coming in and out of the mouth of the Columbia River.

In the next 10 years, average annual cargo predicted is roughly 12 million tons.

Ten years ago not more than 150 ships came into the Columbia River that would draw over 28 feet; 5 years ago 800 were drawing over 28 feet. The trend, of course, is for deeper draught vessels. The channel project depth now is 40 feet of depth over one-half mile of width.

A survey has been ordered by the Public Works Committee of Congress. That survey determined the project inadequate and its inadequacy was attested by the district engineer of the Corps of Engineers, also the division engineer, Chief of Engineers, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the States of Washington and Oregon officially, the House of Representatives, and the Senate of the United States.

A new project authorized called for 48 feet of depth over a half mile of width running through the bar and 3 miles into the estuary. The project calls for a bit less than $3 million for dredging, and a bit more than $5 million for a jetty projecting from an inshore point on the Washington shore toward the channel to direct the flow toward the end that encroaching sands of Clatsop Spit would be carried away and deposited at sea.

All of the above agencies mentioned have agreed that the 48-foot half-mile project is desirable. It has been authorized by Congress.

Somewhere along the line, either in the Office of the Corps of Engineers of the Bureau of the Budget, there has been failure to recommend funds for this sorely needed project. Those funds are not in the budget you are considering. They are in part needed this year; $900,000 is the amount sought.

In the period October to April, the violent North Pacific pounds against the Columbia River entrance; waves of 20-foot height were visited upon the area 10 days ago; 30-foot waves in the wintertime are maximum.

Early work is needed for the following reasons:

First, today, it is necessary to load ships at less than capacity—this is an economic waste which can be avoided.

Second, ships must delay arrival or departure when a heavy sea is breaking into Columbia River; thus additional losses are piled up against the ship operators.

Third, ships must pay for repairs due to groundings because tail shafts are cracked, rudders are broken due to an inadequate depth at the mouth of the Columbia River.

Fourth, ships must inevitably pay higher insurance rates as these marine losses pile up. Fortunately, there has been only one ship lost completely in the last few years. Of course that loss is reflected in insurance rates on all shipping in the area. Paying for these losses eventually are the people who are concerned with the shipping and receiving of cargoes carried by these vessels.

There are roughly 5 million people in the 4 Pacific Northwest States. Of that number 3.2 million are served by the 13 Columbia River ports lying between Astoria and Portland. Their whole economy is hinged to Columbia River transportation. Delay in pursuing the new proj-

ect to early completion is retarding the economic growth of the area and adversely affects the welfare of those 3.2 million people.

This Columbia River improvement has proved a tremendously good investment on the part of the Congress. You have spent approximately $22 million on jetties, $11 million for maintenance over the entire period from 1882 on. You have spent some $45 million on the entire river. The $45 million investment annually gives you a 33⅓-percent return in the form of transportation savings, and because the mouth of the river is the key to these savings, we locally claim the improvements would pay a substantially higher ratio of return than estimated by the Corps of Engineers. We claim since the entrance is the key to all shipping on the Columbia River there will be a 33⅓-percent return on anything invested at the Columbia River mouth.

Somewhere there has been some wrong thinking about this project. It has been authorized, the expenditure for its construction is admitted as desirable.

At a time when the economy of the United States is at its highest, when traffic on the Columbia River is growing, when the demand for lumber from the area is likely to be the heaviest in history, due to the heavy construction program of this Nation today, we are told that for some unknown reason funds are not recommended. Whether this is an error or omission on the part of the Bureau of the Budget or the Corps of Engineers, we do not know. We do ask that the appropriation be made by this committee in order that maximum dredging may be done before October when the storms start.

Delay means further loss. Whereas only one ship has been lost, whereas light loading has been necessary and delays have been common, these should not be visited upon the seventh export port of the United States any longer than is necessary.

Certainly it is not necessary to delay this project due to inadequate funds. Congress acts as a board of directors controlling more than 50 percent of the State of Oregon. You are our biggest landowner and business institution. This year 10 billion board-feet of lumber will be taken out of our area and a major part of the timberland is owned by the Federal Government. That timber will return to the Federal Treasury some $75 million this year.

There is a $1½ billion agriculture and livestock industry in the area served by the Columbia River and in States owned 50 percent or more by the Federal Government. I say to you that these lands are sources of revenue for the Federal Government and revenues lost to the State of Oregon. Of course, it is clear that the taxes lost to the State of Oregon on the 53 percent of the State area owned by the Federal Government is in itself a substantial figure.

Oregon should be the last State in the Union that should be coming back here pleading for the appropriation of funds for the improvement of the Columbia River. We urge that the Congress either come forward promptly with our money for improvement of the Columbia River, or let us have the revenue from our lands and let us improve it ourselves.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Ralph Dewey of the Pacific American Steamship Association.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, my name is Ralph B. Dewey. I represent the Pacific American Steamship Association whose headquarters are in San Francisco, Calif., and whose member steamship lines

operate in all the ports of the Pacific coast. We have a very extensive interest in the welfare of the ports on the Columbia River. I would like to file my statement for the record and highlight several points that are contained therein, primarily addressing myself to the navigational aspects of this project.

Of course, we are all aware that the Bureau of the Budget saw fit not to include any funds for this project this year. I have not checked with the Department of Engineers to find what exact amount would be required to get the basic work underway this year but others have that information in these proceedings and will furnish it for the record.

For my part, for the part of the member steamship lines that use the Columbia River so extensively primarily in the carriage of lumber and grain to the sealanes of the world, for our part, we say that it should be started at the very earliest opportunity. There are some 40 steamship lines that use the Columbia River. About 30 of these lines are dry cargo and about 10 of them are tanker. In 1925, only 2 percent of all vessels crossing the bar at Columbia River had drafts exceeding 28 feet. In other words, 1925, a 40-foot depth was adequate because all the vessels were under 28-feet draft. In 1950, the latest statistical information available to me, 27 percent of all vessels had over 29 feet of draft, you see.

Now, the meaning of this is simply that a 40-foot channel with ships having, so many of them, 29 to 35 feet of draft, a 40-foot channel is not adequate when you have a sea that runs at its highest point 15 feet, where we have waves that run as high as 15 feet because the vessels that drop from 15 feet high water have a tendency to sound, which is a phrase which describes the striking of the bottom.

Since 1950, there have been six disasters in the immediate area of the channel of the Columbia, mouth of the Columbia River, all of which occurred because of the sounding of vessels, the striking of the bottom in these 15-foot and higher seas. A previous witness mentioned 20 feet 10 days ago; 15 feet is not unusual; 20 feet is not unusual. The losses sustained by 1 vessel alone or 1 cargo in 1 vessel would more than pay for the initial dredging being asked for by the engineers in this project.

Even short of this, however, incapacitation of vessels due to even the slightest grounding can mean serious losses to their owners. In other words, a number of directions in which losses or damage to equipment, losses in the movement of cargoes, all of which have a— which place a financial burden on various parties of interest to any maritime transaction. I can't emphasize too strongly to the members of this committee the importance of inserting, in your good judgment, in the budget an amount sufficient to begin the dredging of the Columbia River Channel to at least 48 feet and that commencing work which will provide ultimately a channel at least a half mile wide which are the specifications of the present legislation.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Dewey, knowing the situation as you do and being familiar with it, and being an advocate of these matters, how much would you state in your judgment would be necessary to initiate this project, to get it underway?

Mr. DEWEY. The figure of $1 million was given to me about 3 weeks ago, Mr. Chairman. It is in that order of $1 million.

Mr. EVINS. How far would this dredging of necessity have to extend, how many miles, approximately?

Mr. DEWEY. The projected channel crosses the ocean bar and extends into the river mouth for a distance of 3 miles from the seaward end of the jetties, of the entrance. From the seaward end into the river itself a distance of 3 miles. In Document No. 294 published by the Congress, the engineers report, it is shown to be about 3 miles.

I am informed—I would like to amend the previous remarks about the distance involved. The project involves a distance of 3 miles upriver from the channel bar and 3 miles seaward of the channel bar, a total of 6 miles.

Mr. HAND. Give me some light on how normal or abnormal these seas are that you speak of, these 15- or 20-foot seas. Is that frequent, is it an unusual condition, a storm condition, or how frequently do they occur?

Mr. DEWEY. First, to answer your questions one way, the masters of the vessels that I have talked to have told me that entering the Columbia River is one of the most hazardous entrances that they know of, men with 30 and 40 years' experience at sea have said that and that the rise and fall of the water, of the sea, at the mouth of the Columbia River is the highest. That is the reason for the risk that they speak of.

Now, the Columbia River, the 15-foot sea, during a normal season, occurs sufficiently often to cause for the roughly 130 or 140 vessels that are in our association only—we made this study a year ago—our own vessels only lost 40 days, vessel days, that is 24-hour vessel-days as a result of being forced to lay to either on the river side or the ocean side of the Columbia River Bar during a recent winter.

Mr. HAND. As far as you are concerned the study that your group of vessel owners would make indicates approximately 40 days in which the sea was running so high that it was hazardous to go into the channel?

Mr. DEWEY. That would be, to say exactly, there were 46 vessel-days but there may have been 2 vessels standing by in other days. There may have been other 15-foot days when there were no vessels crossing so that the loss of 40 vessel-days to which I refer is the number of days that the sea was running 15 feet.

Mr. HAND. Any official reports available which would indicate more precisely the situation there with respect to unusually heavy seas?

Mr. DEWEY. The engineers' report deals with that matter in much more detail, Mr. Hand.

Mr. HAND. Thank you, sir.

Mr. NORBLAD. I might add that I have lived in the mouth of the Columbia River all my life and during the fall and winter and spring it is very common. In summer, the weather is fairly nice.

(Mr. Dewey's statement is as follows:)

My name is Ralph B. Dewey. I represent Pacific American Steamship Association whose headquarters are in San Francisco, Calif. Our member steamship lines comprise the majority of all deepwater dry cargo operators on the Pacific coast; and all of our companies make some use of the Columbia River ports. We are, therefore, keenly interested in navigational improvements at the mouth of the Columbia River.

Our association is in accord with the general recommendations contained in report of the district engineers at Portland, submitted October 1, 1952. The division engineers at Portland, endorsement of December 12, 1952, and the Board

of Engineers in Washington, submitted June 15, 1953, all included in House Document No. 249, 83d Congress.

The district engineers found:

"* * * that deepening of the bar and entrance channels at the mouth of Columbia River is essential to safe navigation by deep-draft ships. Furthermore, savings and benefits are sufficient to justify deepening the navigation channel to 48 feet at mean lower low water. He, therefore, recommends that the existing project for Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington, be modified to provide for channels 48 feet deep, at mean lower low water, and not less than one-half mile wide across the bar and in the entrance at an estimated cost of $2,898,000 for new work and $240,000 annually for additional maintenance."

The division engineers recommend:

"* * * that the existing project for Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington, be modified to provide a channel of suitable alinement with a depth of 48 feet at mean lower low water over a width of not less than one-half mile at an estimated first cost of not to exceed $8,555,000, to be secured initially by dredging at an estimated first cost of $2,898,000 plus $240,000 annually for additional maintenance and that spur jetty or such other contraction works at a first cost of not to exceed $5,657,000 be provided at a future date as may be found necessary and economically justifiable by the Chief of Engineers."

The Board of Engineers recommends:

"* * * modifications of the existing projects for Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington, to provide for a channel of suitable alinement with depth of 48 feet at mean lower low water for a width of one-half mile, to be secured by dredging and the construction of a spur jetty on the north shore at an estimated cost to the United States of $8,555,000 for new work and $195,000 annually for maintenance in addition to that now required; all generally in accordance with the plans of the district engineer, as modified by the above comments, and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable."

All these reports agree that the bar and entrance channels should be dredged to 48 feet at low water for a width of one-half mile, on present alinement. They differ slightly on the technical matter of whether to dredge to 48 feet, $2,989,000, and to build the proposed jetty, $5,657,000, simultaneously, or whether to do the dredging first and later, after observations of scouring which may be caused by a change in the currents when the greater channel depth is provided, ask for appropriations to build the jetty.

Our comments in these proceedings are confined to an explanation of our essential needs, as vessel operators of a 48-foot channel, one-half mile wide. How it is arrived at is a technical matter which the Army engineers and the Members of Congress are eminently qualified to judge.

Bounteous resources afford large surpluses which move to market in large part by water routes. The district engineers' report spells out in great detail the resources of the area tributary to the Columbia River. These resources all combine to produce a volume of essential goods far in excess of the needs of the local area. Deepwater transportation down the Columbia to the sealanes of the United States and the world has always been and will continue to be the principal avenue for the marketing of this bounteous surplus of lumber and forest products, grains of all kinds, fresh and canned fruits and vegetables, canned and frozen fish, livestock, wool, meats, and paper products. Two aluminum companies are located adjacent to deep water on the lower Columbia River and have in prospect the inbound movement of ores.

Both the foreign exportation of the area's products, as well as water shipments to other United States areas, has increased 300 percent since 1905. In 1905 there were 345 foreign exports and 300,000 domestic shipments, while in 1950 there were 1,332,000 foreign exports and 1,319,000 domestic shipments. Foreign imports have remained fairly constant over the period, while domestic inbound shipments have increased 330 percent. In 1905 foreign imports amounted to 107,000 and domestic receipts were 195,000. In 1950 the foreign imports were 108,000 and domestic receipts were 6,455,000.

Total commerce up and down the Columbia has averaged 10 million tons for the past 3 years. The engineers estimate an average of 14 million tons of cargo will move annually over the next 10 years.

The mouth of the Columbia River is the only access steamship companies have to a vast tributary area covering 300,000 square miles in the 4 States of the Pacific Northwest. Commencing at the river mouth, Columbia River ports are

12 in number. They are Warrenton, Oreg.; Astoria, Oreg.; Bradwood, Oreg.; Wauna, Oreg.; Westport Slough, Oreg.; Longview, Wash.; Rainier, Oreg.; Kalama, Wash.; St. Helens, Oreg.; Multnomah Channel, Oreg.; Portland, Oreg.; Vancouver, Wash.

Extensive steamship services make use of Columbia River ports. Some 40 shiplines offer service to and from Columbia River ports. Thirty of these are dry-cargo operators, the balance tanker. Dry-cargo vessels carry about 40 percent of the total tonnage, principally grain, 1,500,000 tons per year, lumber, 2 million tons per year, general merchandise outbound, 750,000 tons per year, and general cargo inbound, 250,000 tons per year.

Larger vessels make 40-foot depth inadequate. In 1925, only 2 percent of all vessels crossing the bar had drafts exceeding 28 feet. In 1950, 27 percent of all vessels had 28 or more of draft. Furthermore, the average size of the vessels has doubled in the same period. The increased size is most conspicuous in tankships, many of which draw 33 feet when loaded.

In quiet waters, a 40-foot draft would be ample to permit passage of our modern merchant vessels. But at the Columbia River Bar, the water is far from quiet. When storm waves are running, vessels have struck bottom in water which exceeds their draft by 15 feet or more. Under such wave conditions, any ship having over 25 feet of draft or more runs the risk of striking bottom on crossing the bar. To avoid this risk, masters of vessels either cruise or lay at anchor outside the bar or else they purposely delay their arrivals at the channel mouth to avoid the agony of "laying to" until the waves subside. The district engineers state in their report that in the winter of 1948–49, nearly 40 vessel-days were lost due to known delays at the bar, at a cost to vessel owners of $88,000. In the winter of 1951–52, our own member lines alone experienced 15 specific delays ranging from a few hours to 2½ days. No estimate of the cost of the deliberate slowing up of vessels is made, but the experence, at least of our own association, indicates that in an average year it is about equal to the direct delays.

A further hazard to navigation at the Columbia River Bar is the advance of a large sandbar known as Clatsop Spit from the southwest into the channel entrance. This has resulted in a crowding of the chanel northward, thereby increasing the angle of intersection of the two entrance range lights so that it difficult and risky for ships to make the turn at the proper place in the channel. Furthermore, ships tend to stay well to the northern side of the chanel where it is sure to be deeper. That is not without its own risks, however, as this puts the vessel dangerously close to the weather shore during the winter storms.

It is obvious why the ship operator urges immediate action by the Congress to finance the dredging and realinement of the channel at the mouth of the Columbia River.

Seven groundings since 1947 at channel mouth—one total loss. Stark evidence of the need for chanel improvements are the seven recent groundings reported by the Coast Guard, six of which have occurred since 1950.

All of the disasters occurred because of "sounding" of the vessels that is, the dropping as much as 15 feet, of the vessel from the peak of a wave to the lowermost point of its trough; at least 4 of the "soundings" occurred in depths greater than 40 feet.

One of the disasters, the *Drexel Victory*, grounded on January 20, 1947, and shortly thereafter broke in two, drifted to sea, and sank. A cargo valued at $2½ million and a vessel valued at $1,200,000 were a total loss. Fortunately no crew members were lost.

The losses sustained by this one vessel and cargo alone would more than pay for the initial dredging being asked for by the engineers for this project. It cannot be too greatly emphasized that a grounding in heavy weather at the channel mouth could very easily set the stage for a catastrophic loss of crew personnel, vessel, and cargo. Even short of this, however, repair costs and incapacitation of vessels due to even a slight grounding of a vessel can mean serious losses to their owners.

Marine underwriters have long recognized the hazards to navigation attendant upon crossing the Columbia River Bar. At one time, restrictive warranties were added to policies on ships and cargoes using the Columbia River. If something isn't done to reduce the present hazardous situation, the underwriters might be forced to reinstate such warranties. This would be a serious setback for the ports of the Columbia River in their quest for competitive cargoes.

In summarizing, I wish to emphasize that the support of all ship lines which make use of the Columbia River is 100 percent for this project. Any further delay will be costly, not only to us but to the ports and shippers we serve. Even if this committee acted today, and the Appropriations Committee acted next week, it would take 3 years before dredging activities could be completed and the channel could be declared safe for navigation. We are convinced that the Federal funds expended for this project will more than be repaid in safety for ship and crew, peace of mind for shipmasters and pilots, and direct monetary savings for ship operators. In our view, a continuation of the presently critically dangerous conditions at the Columbia River Bar is unthinkable.

Mr. NORBLAD. Next I would like to present Mr. Robert F. Donoghue of the Pacific American Tankship Association.

Mr. DONOGHUE. I am Robert F. Donoghue, a member of the firm of Donoghue & Ragan, attorneys with offices in the Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C. I am appearing in connection with the project for deepening the channel at the mouth of the Columbia River on behalf of the Pacific American Tankship Association which is composed of the following companies, located on the Pacific coast of the United States, owning and operating tankships. General Petroleum Corp., Hillcone Steamship Co., Keystone Shipping Co., Richfield Oil Corp., Standard Oil Company of California, The Texas Co., Tidewater Associated Oil Co., Union Oil Company of California.

The modification of the existing Federal project to deepen the channel at the mouth of the Columbia River to a depth of 48 feet, as explained in House Document No. 249, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,555,000 was authorized by Congress in Public Law 780, 83d Congress, 2d session. The projected channel crosses the ocean bar and extends into the river mouth for a distance of 3 miles from the seaward end of the north and south jetties at the entrance.

For many years our members have been concerned about the difficulties and dangers attendant upon the passage of tank vessels through the entrance at the mouth of the Columbia River. That their concern is justified is indicated by the fact that in 1950, as reported by the Army engineers in House Document No. 249, 83d Congress, 2d session, page 24, movement of petroleum products through the mouth of the Columbia River amounted to approximately 6 million tons, almost all of which was inbound, and constituted almost 60 percent of the total cargo movement through the entrance. The growth in population and commercial activities in this area has been rapid and extensive and is indicated by the increase in the movement of petroleum products from 3 million tons in 1940 to almost 6 million tons in 1950. The bulk of these petroleum products moves in tank vessels.

The increasing consumption of petroleum in this area has resulted in the necessity for employing progressively larger tank vessels in the movement. The records compiled by the Army engineers disclose that in 1950 almost 400 vessels with drafts in excess of 30 feet passed through the entrance. Since 1950, the number of voyages made by tank vessels has increased. I do not have the complete figures but 1 of our members reported 91 voyages in 1952 and 70 voyages in 1953 of tankers drawing in excess of 30 feet of water. The reports of the other members when received will be in proportion to the size of their fleets but it is safe to assume that the aggregate number would be considerably in excess of the number of voyaies reported in 1950. Moreover, tank vessels of even greater draft will undoubtedly take their place in the trade within the foreseeable future.

The present depth of the channel is 40 feet. The report of the engineers indicates that when storm waves are running, modern vessels may strike bottom in depths exceeding their draft by 15 feet or more, House Document 249, page 25. The modification of the present depth from 40 feet to 48 feet would be of great importance to tank vessels entering or leaving the river. It would tend to eliminate or greatly reduce the amount of time lost because of delays arising out of bar conditions and the loss incurred in shutting out cargo because of inadequate water over the bar, and most important of all, would tend to eliminate or minimize the hazards to which the vessels and their personnel are presently exposed because of the inadequate depth of water on the bar. The report of the Army engineers points out the hazards of navigating the entrance because of the simultaneous shoaling of the channel and increase in the size of the ships and sets forth the data with respect to the accidents which have occurred in that area.

While the authorized project contemplates the expenditure of $8,555,000, we are not requesting that the full amount be appropriated for fiscal year 1956. We believe that at this time an appropriation for $3 million would be sufficient for the fiscal year 1956. Our belief is founded upon information supplied by the Army engineers that the sum of $3 million will be sufficient to defray the cost of all work that can reasonably be expected to be performed on the project during fiscal year 1956. Since the Army engineers is the agency that will undertake the necessary work and should have the best idea of the amount and nature of the work to be undertaken during fiscal year 1956, we are satisfied to rest upon their judgment, and accordingly respectfully request that your committee recommend the appropriation of $3 million in fiscal year 1956 for the necessary work on the Columbia River authorized under Public Law 780 referred to above.

We appreciate the courtesy of being permitted to appear before your committee on this matter.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, these members of our association are very vitally interested in this project. In 1950, approximately 6 million tons of petroleum moved through the Columbia River mouth. The growth in the population and commercial activities has been so rapid and extensive that considerably more than 6 million tons are anticipated to move over the next several years. In fact, it would probably double in just petroleum alone.

In 1950, about 400 vessels with drafts in excess of 30 feet passed over that bar. One of our members reported 81 voyages in 1952 and 70 voyages in 1953. I haven't got the figures on all of the members but there are considerably more than 400 reported in 1950.

One of the problems here is, as the Army engineers have pointed out in their report, that these vessels need 15 feet below their keel when they pass over the bar in order to be sure that they are going to clear. The ships, the tankers that are running now, are from 28 feet to 35 feet draft; so that a 40-foot channel is a very hazardous situation to encounter. They have many times where they just lay up inside or outside waiting for the proper weather to occur.

The time lost in these ships waiting, of course, would amount to a very tremendous sum.

One other thing we have to think about is that we still have a pretty precarious situation in the Far East. These tankers are probably the most important element of our shipping fleet. The loss of one tanker

would be very detrimental to the interests of the Nation. Even the delay of tankers moving up and down this west coast would be detrimental so it is absolutely imperative and take—we agree with the statements made by the previous witnesses that this work should be undertaken as rapidly as possible. I think the fact that there was not any money in it was due to the fact that this bill was passed at the end of the last session and the budget had been prepared before that time but nevertheless this has to get underway, gentlemen. We had been told that about $3 million would be all that would be necessary for 1956. Subsequently we learned that $3 million is quite high. Possibly a million or a million and a half is all they can adequately use in this operation. But something should be put in there to get this thing started because where you have, say, a 40-foot projected channel at the present time, there isn't 40-foot of space there; that is when you start dredging. But it starts to fill up almost immediately. So you have 35-foot channel where you may be trying to put a 32-foot ship across it.

Just again I want to thank you gentlemen for letting us appear and I want to confirm our position that we are in entire accord with the other witnesses who have been here and request that every—request that you have a proper amount in the budget to take care of this situation.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Donoghue.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Norblad is one of our very fine Congressmen, a fine colleague.

Mr. EVINS. Which I said initially and in which I concur.

Mr. JENSEN. He is not in the habit of asking the Federal Government for things which they can do themselves. I realize that. It has been my privilege, Mr. Norblad, to hear your testimony on this item. Could I ask you, are you wholeheartedly in favor of this?

Mr. NORBLAD. I think so. It is very much needed or your shipping on the Columbia River is going to completely bog down in a very few years.

Mr. JENSEN. So I ask you what the private shipping concerns, and the local people are doing to alleviate this problem or have they done anything?

Mr. NORBLAD. They are doing nothing. This has been a Federal navigation problem for 50 to 75 years, I presume. It is a shipping project involving the entire Nation. It is a large one. There has been no local work that I know about.

Mr. FARMER. Astoria and Portland subscribed to it; that was eliminated in the second bill, in 1887.

Mr. NORBLAD. The overall problem which would be $8 million for dredging project which is purely a Federal project——

Mr. JENSEN. As I understand it, you not only want to deepen the channel, but you want to widen it, is that right?

Mr. NORBLAD. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. How wide is it now on an average?

Mr. FARMER. It is shifting over now to the north side, 70 feet over there; 70 feet on the north side and it runs less than half a mile but when you have ebb tide your water sets against the north jetty and north and south jetty and it is unsafe for shipping to go over there in heavy water, so they must go in the channel about a quarter mile.

Originally it was 48-foot over a mile. They want now 48 feet over half a mile for a 6-mile stretch.

Mr. JENSEN. What is the depth of the present channel? What is it supposed to be?

Mr. FARMER. The project depth is 40 feet.

Mr. JENSEN. You want how deep?

Mr. FARMER. 48.

Mr. NORBLAD. The point being, when you have large vessels the thing will go down to 25 feet because of weather conditions. So it is not adequate depth for the size of ships they are building nowadays.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you very much.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

SANTA MARIA PROJECT AND THE PORT HUENEME PROJECT

WITNESS

HON. CHARLES TEAGUE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. We will hear Congressman Teague of California.

Mr. TEAGUE. I will be very brief. I have two matters to present to the committee. One is the Santa Maria project. All of the engineering data and technical information is before the committee, I am sure. The project has been authorized, of course, by the Congress. There is a sum of $1 million in the current budget to get it started. This is one of those good, comparatively small projects which are designed to prevent running off of water into the ocean, to dam up those floodwaters so they may be released into the gravels and to some extent alleviate the terrific water shortages in California.

I know the area well, of course; the water shortage in that area is critical. Most all of the saved water will go to the benefit of agriculture and the city of Santa Maria, domestic and agricultural use; there is practically no industry in the area. The project, as I say, has been approved, is feasible and I hope the committee will see fit to approve the amount in the budget.

I will pass to another subject unless there are some questions, Mr. Chairman, that any of the members have on that one.

The other one is the so-called Port Hueneme project which I understand has been presented to the committee by the United States engineers.

Port Hueneme, which you gentlemen probably know, is on the California coast. It is one of our major navy installations, as is Point Magu which is 6 miles down the coast, both being in my district. We have a very serious beach erosion situation there which is threatening our Navy installations as well as the other property in the area. I received this telegram yesterday. I would like to read it into the record.

Sea erosion critical here. Now win [sic] 70 feet of point of maximum erosion before recent Government sand-pumping operation. Protective action urgent. Starting of proposed small-boat harbor dredging project with pumping of sand to south of harbor mouth as planned by Army engineers would counteract

erosion. Please advise status of appropriation for previously approved boat harbor project. Urge you do everything possible to expedite appropriation for proposed boat harbor this session.

RALPH MCKEEHAN,
Mayor, City of Port Hueneme.

As I see it, the very much incidental benefit of a small-boat harbor there which the people would like to make there is not the important thing. The important thing is the protection of Port Hueneme, and Magu, which is Federal Government. Furthermore, the Federal Government has responsibility in this as I am sure the engineering data before you will establish in that this beach erosion is caused, according to all the engineers, by the fact that the harbor, the port, Port Hueneme Harbor, has changed the natural flow of tides so that it has eroded the beach for long sections. It has washed out a road, for instance, between Point Magu and Port Hueneme. This project, as I see it, is a means of protecting Federal property which is by far the bulk of the property in the area. Those are two huge or comparatively huge and major naval installations. They certainly should be protected. I feel that the information that the United States engineers have given you must have substantiated that. I want you to know I have looked at it myself. I have seen the erosion. It is there; it is not something that anybody is imagining. It is something that should be corrected, I think, urgently. As I understand it, the present status is a request for an appropriation of $70,000 to complete the engineering and allocation and matters of that sort.

I would also like to offer into evidence for the committee a resolution passed by the board of supervisors of Ventura County, Calif., urging that this project be approved and carried forth.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Teague, for your very fine statement.

You are supporting the items in the budget in the exact amounts recommended?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes; I am.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF VENTURA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, AUGUST 10, 1954

Present: Supervisors L. A. Price, chairman, Presiding, A. C. Ax, Robert W. Lefever, C. H. Andrews, and Edwin L. Carty. L. E. Hallowell, clerk; by Shirley Weeks, deputy.

404.2 ADOPTING RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF SMALL CRAFT HARBOR AT VENTURA COUNTY

Whereas on the 29th day of June 1954, Lester Price, Robert Lefever, Edwin Carty, and A. C. Ax, members of the Ventura County Board of Supervisors, met at the request of William S. Sifford, chairman for Ventura County of the advisory committee of the State legislative interim committee in terms of small-craft harbors, together with representatives of the Ventura Port District and the proponents of the proposed harbor at Silver Strand in Ventura County; and

Whereas after a full discussion and it having been decided upon a motion duly made by C. Dalton Munger, Jr., seconded by E. H. Houchin, and carried unanimously that this group go on record that it will support any program for a small-boat recreational harbor as may be recommended by the Army engineers in Ventura County: now, therefore, upon motion of Supervisor Ax, seconded by Supervisor Lefever, and duly carried, be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors, representing all of the interests of the people of Ventura County does hereby go on record as offering their full support and cooperation in terms of furthering the efforts which are being made

to obtain a small-craft harbor and that they will, as representatives of the people of Ventura County, make every possible effort to obtain Ventura County's proportionate share in terms of tidelands oil moneys impounded which will become available and in terms of any Federal moneys which may become available for the purpose of construction of a small-craft harbor in the County of Ventura.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PROJECT AND THE SACRAMENTO SHIP CHANNEL

WITNESSES

HON. LEROY JOHNSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

WARREN H. ATHERTON, STOCKTON PORT DISTRICT, STOCKTON, CALIF.

Mr. EVINS. We will hear now Mr. Leroy Johnson of California and a group of those that he wishes to present to the committee. We are always pleased to hear from Mr. Johnson. He is a great and fine Congressman and a strong advocate for the position which he takes. We are glad to hear from you.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you very much. I have reduced my thoughts to writing so I will stay right on the beam and not take up too much time. I am here trying to get a small appropriation which is not in the budget. This appropriation would protect some valuable public property against serious damage.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity you have afforded me to make a statement concerning a serious flood menace in my congressional district.

I am referring to the flood dangers on the lower San Joaquin River. The project to strengthen the levees on the lower San Joaquin was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1942.

The flood menace is particularly acute on the lower San Joaquin. That fact was demonstrated in 1950, 1951, and 1952 when we had disastrous floods in the area of the lower San Joaquin River in the vicinity of the Mossdale Bridge. The flood was so violent that it washed out a Southern Pacific Railroad Bridge and also a heavy concrete highway bridge on Highway 50, a national superhighway which goes from Oakland, Calif., to Baltimore, passing through Washington.

The damage caused by these floods was over $7½ million. The reason that the flood in this area are so violent is because they are in the lower reaches of the river. The altitude at this area is only between 10 and 15 feet above sea level, and consequently its flow is slow and sluggish. I might add, listening to the previous witness, about the intrusion of salt water, in this area we have trouble with that. It is so low that it has gone all the way up to Stockton and has presented a menace to agriculture.

The San Joaquin is the major river draining the lower San Joaquin Valley.

Mr. JENSEN. Will you point out where this project is so we can follow you?

Mr. JOHNSON. You see the name, Fresno, there? A little to the north of Fresno are the words "San Joaquin River." It goes up to

Modesto and a little town called Tracy. Then it continues on toward Stockton and goes into an area that is known as the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. That is the area.

It flows northward and enters the San Joaquin-Sacramento Delta a short distance west of Stockton, Calif.

Into the San Joaquin in the spring, up to about the end of June, pour a number of rivers, whose sources are in the Sierra Nevada Mountains. When spring comes the deep snowbanks of the Sierras begin to melt and the water is carried to the San Joaquin by the rivers whose sources are high in the Sierras. The San Joaquin is really the end of the funnel which carries the water from the Sierra Nevada Mountains from an area east of Fresno north to about Alpine Lake, through about 7 or 8 rivers, tributaries of the San Joaquin, and it then moves on down to the delta of the San Joaquin and into San Francisco Bay.

This plea for money to strengthen the levees of the San Joaquin, especially north of the mouth of the Stanislaus River, which is only a few miles upstream from where the big damage was done in 1950, 1951, and 1952, has a peculiar claim on your help.

The reason for a special claim on you for help is due to the fact that the Federal Government has some very important military stations which could be damaged very badly should the San Joaquin River run riot again.

The largest station is Sharpe General Depot, the largest Army general depot in the West. It was built before the Pearl Harbor attack at a cost of over $50 million, and considerable money has since been spent on this large depot. It borders on the San Joaquin, or very near it, and a flood could do tremendous damage to this property.

There is also an annex to this depot which could be damaged if a large flood should break out again. This annex is near the city of Tracy. It stores vast quantities of QM supplies. Its cost was also large, but not nearly as large as the general depot. Here also is a medical supply storage unit. This took all the medical supplies in the area, San Francisco area where they were stored, and brought them up here. The purpose of it was in the event of an attack in the San Francisco Bay area, which you know is one of the prime targets on the Pacific coast, they could get their medical supplies out of this interior depot about 50 or 60 miles east of the San Francisco Bay area.

Great quantities of these medical supplies are kept there for use in the event of an attack on the San Francisco Bay area. In the event of an attack on that area, thousands would evacuate eastward in the vicinity of Stockton, Tracy, and other cities. The Federal civil-defense group is counting on these medical supplies in the event of trouble.

Then there is a naval installation called the Stockton Annex, a branch of the Naval Supply Depot in Alameda. The annex near Stockton borders on the San Joaquin and should we have an unusually large flood, this station could be flooded. It is located just west of Stockton on an island known as Rough and Ready Island, which in times past has been flooded. Vast naval supplies and some strategic supplies are stored on this base. Numerous mothball ships are tied up along this island. Those are Federal installations there that

require protection. The one flood could be many, many times what you might happen to give us for flood protection.

Another institution that could be very seriously injured should we have another flood similar to the ones in 1950–52, is a California State prison for young offenders, known as Deuel Reformatory. It is on the flat ground along the San Joaquin River and could be very badly damaged by a big flood. Its cost was $20 million.

Still another institution that has special interest for the civil-defense organization is the San Joaquin County General Hospital. It has a thousand-bed hospital, a part of which is set aside and is being held for use, should there be an attack in the San Francisco Bay area. The rooms are being kept for use of evacuees should there be an attack. This institution could be badly damaged if a big flood breaks loose.

You are, undoubtedly, wondering why there is such a critical need now and why these places were built in such close proximity to the dangerous San Joaquin River. The reason is fairly simple: In the early days when this area was first developed, after the turn of the century, the levee work was done by local reclamation districts, aided sometimes by the State. Considerable time has elapsed since the United States assumed the obligation to provide flood protection.

In 1938 President Roosevelt laid down the policy that the Federal Government should assume the responsibility for flood-control development. Since then we have looked to the Federal Government. In 1944, when we presented our claim to the Public Works Committee for authorization to strengthen these levees, we had no difficulty at all in getting the authorization. Much work has been done on the levee work on the Tuolumne, in the Merced stream group, and at other places upstream from the place now under consideration, and on tributaries. So we are merely completing the authorization by doing this levee work now. We have cheerfully supported this other improvement, as it tended to help our situation, but we, being at the most vulnerable place along the river, feel we should now get some help, especially since we have not had any up to date.

Also, this committee last year gave the district engineers $70,000 for planning this project. That money has been used to make plans for this work and to draft specifications so bids might be published for the work. We were told by the division engineer at San Francisco that the plans are all ready and if a small amount of money is given this year, say $250,000, this money could be put to work at the end of this flood season and then the year after, the next year, the balance of the job could be finished in 1956. I think you understand that the flood season reaches its peak in June. It is hard to tell exactly when it will come. It depends upon the intensity of the melting of the snows. It can go up and down very rapidly. The idea that the engineers would like to carry out is that, if they get a small amount of money, after July 1 they have their plans all ready. They could invite bids and from then up until way into December they could strengthen some of these levees. Also, I have been advised that there is money available that has been appropriated but not used, so why not use it this year and thereby insure against loss again should next year bring us another flood.

I understand that Colonel Berrigan, the division engineer at San Francisco, has had an informal conference with the subcommittee and outlined the situation and how you could give us a little help this year which would start the work toward completion. I do hope you can give us some encouragement in our desire to get some work done to avoid these very serious floods.

We understand next year there will be money in the budget so, if we get a little start this year, next year you can give us enough so we could finish the job the following year.

In addition to the public property involved, there are a number of important industries that could be damaged, as well as considerable property in the western part of Stockton that could be subjected to floods. This danger was pointed out to us by Maj. U. S. Grant, now Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, retired, in the middle twenties when he was a district engineer in San Francisco. At that time we were building the port and I had intimate dealing with General Grant because I was representing the city of Stockton. He pointed out to us several times that if a bad flood comes on the west side or down opposite Stockton, the lower part of our city toward the west might get a very bad drenching. He described to us how the San Joaquin could under certain circumstances prove to be a dangerous stream which might flood a great part of west Stockton, which is located on low, flat land.

I appreciate very much that you gave me the opportunity and if there are any questions I would be pleased to answer them.

Mr. EVINS. Have you taken this matter up with the Budget Bureau and requested recommendation of funds?

Mr. JOHNSON. I did. I took it up with the Deputy Chief of the Budget Bureau and they did not give me much encouragement. I did not go back any more. I talked to them and two people who helped draft the plans for this project.

Mr. EVINS. What has the Corps of Engineers said to you in the way of the amount of funds that would be needed for the next fiscal year?

Mr. JOHNSON. He hasn't said anything in particular, but he intimated if we could get a quarter of a million dollars we could make a very good start.

Mr. EVINS. Is that the amount that you are recommending that this committee give consideration to?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir; we would be very pleased to have that amount.

Mr. EVINS. I see.

Mr. JOHNSON. I might point out that as a precedent we built a flood control dam on Little John Creek, known as the Farmington Dam. I appeared before a similar committee at that time when Mr. Engel, of Michigan, was chairman. That is the way they started us off. They gave us $250,000 and in a short while we got the full amount and completed the dam in several years——

Mr. EVINS. I am sure the committee will give consideration to your request.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you feel that the Army Engineers would tell this committee they would favor an appropriation of a quarter of a million dollars for the purpose which you recommend?

Mr. JOHNSON. I only talked to one man; that was the division engineer who has that area. He is now located in San Francisco. I know he would favor it very heartily. What his discussions were with the Chief of Engineers, I don't know.

Mr. JENSEN. Can we put that down, black on white?

Mr. JOHNSON. That engineering; yes. He was here before you. Maybe you discussed the matter with him. Paul Berrigan, his name was.

Mr. EVINS. The committee has had some testimony from the division engineer of Stockton area.

Mr. JENSEN. Did he substantiate everything you are saying, or vice versa?

Mr. JOHNSON. He is very anxious to get started. He feels if there is a little money that could be made available he could get the thing started; year after next we would complete it and wipe out this very dangerous situation that we have there.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it your feeling that by appropriating this amount now that it would save more dollars in the future?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think it would. I think it would be a very good investment, myself.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you feel that this matter is purely a responsibility of the Federal Government and that sooner or later the Federal Government will be called on to make this, to do this work?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, I think it is distinctly a Federal obligation now to take care of this. This is a big, navigable stream; that Stockton has a port there that ships vessels all over the world. Almost any ship can go into the port of Stockton, which is 80 miles from the Golden Gate. It travels through the Golden Gate bay area and up through the delta through which they ship millions of tons a year from that port.

I am sure that anybody who knows the background of this type of legislation will recognize that this is a Federal responsibility; and on top of that, we have those very expensive and important Federal installations which require protection.

Mr. EVINS. I believe Mr. Atherton, former national commander of the American Legion, wishes to make a statement.

He is accompanied by other gentlemen who wish to be heard.

Mr. ATHERTON. I feel on the wrong end of the cart here because I feel I should present some reasons why a proposition should not be paid to be given appropriations at this time. I understand the presentation in favor of the project has not been made.

I am in Washington to present this matter and if it should be that there are any matters, doubt or confusion following the presentation, or matters as to which you think I should make some explanation, I would greatly appreciate the privilege of testifying later.

It is my information, Mr. Chairman, that the city of Sacramento is probably next on the calendar to ask that an appropriation be made outside the budget to begin digging the 30-mile canal across Sacramento which would enable the construction of a port at that city. Our port has been in existence for 20 years and is at Stockton. On the maps which I have presented to you, you will see indicated in a solid line the existing deep water channel from the San Francisco Bay to the city of Stockton. By a dotted line, the proposed channel from

midway of the existing channel to the city of Sacramento. I have brought a California map, gentlemen, but I believe you can see from here the area colored in green on that large map (water resource development). That roughly covers the interior valleys of California from which nearly all of the tonnage emanates which moves out through the San Francisco Bay area which is about midway from south to north. So that the rice, the barley, the canned goods, the lumber which come from that area must be converged at the center and then they are shipped out through the Golden Gate.

The Sacramento project is one that has been before the Congress for a long period of time. It was first approved in 1946. So far, the project has not been commenced and I surmise perhaps because the benefit-cost ratio is low as established by the engineers. At this time it is 1.12 to 1. I understand that if this drops below one, appropriations are not made. This is close to one and the project is probably low on the long list of projects that are waiting.

Also, there is a lack of urgency because business through the Golden Gate, commercial tonnage, has been steadily dropping, tonnage in and tonnage out. Coastwise traffic was formerly a great deal—there was formerly a great deal of coastwise traffic from Seattle, Los Angeles, Portland, San Francisco, which has almost completely disappeared. Business has gone to the railroads and the trucks. Intercoastal trade has dropped. The Pacific trade, as you might well expect, is practically gone except for some military tonnage, the most of which is handled through military terminals. There are now six ports on the bay area: San Francisco, Oakland, Alameda, Redwood City, Richmond, and Stockton. Uncle Sam is a partner in all of them. We all had very substantial Federal assistance to establish these ports. There is a very large annual maintenance cost to keep those ports going.

If I may use the simile, we have got six grocery stores on this block now. They are running, half of them are running, at a deficit because of lack of business and the proposal is to put a seventh store on the same block. We don't think it is economic. There won't be 1 ton of new tonnage created, maritime tonnage, by the digging of the canal and the establishment of the proposed port. It will take some tonnage away from the existing ports. Principally, it will take it away from Stockton, the inland port which I am here representing. We have been in existence for 23 years. We now are slightly in the black. Some of the tonnage which originated above Sacramento, north of Sacramento, now moves through Stockton, a substantial part of it, and if that was taken from Stockton, we are positive that both ports would have to run at a deficit. No return to the Federal investment. The estimate is it would cost $37 million to construct the channel and the port; that is, of Federal funds. And we don't believe that it is justified at this time.

Our engineering people advise that the cost-benefit ratio has been steadily dropping until now it is only 0.53 to 1. That is because of the mounting cost of operation of ships. It will take 2 days to service Sacramento from San Francisco and the original estimate was that ships would cost $2,400 a day to make that run.

The testimony before the Senate committee by the steamship association was that that cost is now $3,200 per day. Another factor which must be considered is there are many industrial plants, many mills,

many warehouses, export and import houses in San Francisco, Oakland, that have been in business for years, and so all the tonnage that could be produced, principally barley, rice, and canned goods, will not move though the proposed port. We do not get all the business in the southern inland valleys now because of the established channels of trade. A large part of it moves through the big ports lower down in the Bara Bay area and will continue to do so. When you take that into consideration, we are very certain that Sacramento for the foreseeable future cannot be an economic operating entity.

For instance, the figure has been expressed by those wanting Sacramento that an average pickup of 3,500 tons can be made. For the past year, Stockton including some of this proposed business has only averaged 2,500 tons. So it is evidently quite impossible that there could be a bigger pickup at Sacramento because the State of California owns the port at San Francisco; they appointed a fact-finding committee in 1949 which conducted this study, the result of 2 years' work, to determine what was happening in the bay area. And they have published a statement, a table which I have incorporated with the statement filed that shows that for 15 years before 1950—excuse me, before 1940—there was an actual drop in the ingoing and outgoing commercial tonnage through Golden Gate. Then in taking the war picture out, the tonnage from 1946 to 1950 was substantially less than it had been before the war. So, unfortunately, the tonnage available does not justify the building of another part at this time.

Mr. JENSEN. I do want to say that I am very happy to see our former national commander again. I am sorry that you are walking on a cane. I hope it is temporary. I have enjoyed your testimony.

Mr. EVINS. The committee appreciates your statement. I am sure we will all give it consideration.

Mr. MURRAY. I notice here that you make the very pertinent observation that you feel that ports are really public utilities. From your testimony, I think that it appears that the ports are now regulated by State laws. Is that correct?

Mr. ATHERTON. The port at San Francisco is owned by the State of California. There are some State regulations in connection with navigation that are pertinent to all of us but the State's principal interest is owning the port at San Francisco.

Mr. MURRAY. Did the State create the port at Stockton?

Mr. ATHERTON. It did, and it appropriated some money. Congressman Johnson was our city attorney. Do you remember the answer to that?

Mr. JOHNSON. First we drafted a law similar to Houston's law. I took it to the legislature and they approved it. Then we created a port district which is the river strip half a mile on each side.

Mr. MURRAY. Did the California Legislature create a port district for Sacramento?

Mr. JOHNSON. They have a port district and I am sure that is the way it was done. I think that the law we used was slightly modified to fit their situation because they were in two counties. We were only in one county, in our port district.

Mr. MURRAY. As I understand it, at least, in Illinois where you have a development, and to develop it you would create a port district giving the port district authority to issue revenue bonds or bonds

to pay for the construction and the charges, wharfage fees, and others. The point I am bringing out, I wonder if the situation exists if this port is unfeasible, and it appears from the testimony you have made a very cogent case on it, why does or did the State of California create a port district?

Mr. JOHNSON. The State of California does not create the port district. They amended the law so they could create one themselves by election of people in the area. They had an election and it passed. Then they proceeded to develop their port. They issued some bonds, some general bonds just like we did in Stockton. Our bonds are almost paid out by now.

Mr. MURRAY. That was not the point. I could not clearly understand because if another port is bad economically for the State, and from your testimony it would appear that that would be the situation, why would the State adopt laws to create a port district?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is a matter for the people living in the port who have to pay the taxes. The law sets up machinery how it may be done. That is exactly what Sacramento did. I represented them 10 years in Congress so I knew a little about their situation. But they used a law that we drafted which was copied after Houston, Tex., and modified it so they could have a port district that covers more than one county.

Mr. ATHERTON. No State approval is required, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. MURRAY. That is what I wondered.

(Mr. Atherton's prepared statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF WARREN H. ATHERTON, APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE STOCKTON PORT DISTRICT, STOCKTON, CALIF.

There is no need for a port at Sacramento now.

The area proposed to be served is already served by six ports with surplus capacity and adequate, modern facilities.

Three of these have been operating at a deficit during a part or all of the time since 1946, owing in part to the stoppage of trade with China and other Pacific areas and the rapidly disappearing coastwise and intercoastal trade.

Tonnage through the Golden Gate, to and from northern California, excepting military cargo and oil, has been dropping since 1940.

Military cargo is mostly served by military terminals; oil is served by privately owned specialty facilities.

The existing ports on San Francisco Bay have cost the Federal Government a huge initial investment and now require a large annual maintenance appropriation. The return on that national investment would be lowered by spending more Federal money to create a new port to compete with ports already in being which do not now have enough business.

All of the above facts are irrefutably established by a California State Senate committee report completed in 1951 and brought down to date by our engineering and trade studies.

After consideration of this most thorough report of 598 pages with numerous tables, anaylses, and summaries embracing figures for a period of 10 to 25 years, the conclusion is inevitable that creation of the port of Sacramento will not create new tonnage. It will split the tonnage now being adequately handled by existing ports and will increase their handicaps and deficits. Among these ports, Stockton, as the only inland port, will be most adversely affected.

There is a primary rule in the regulation of public utilities that new investment and competition will not be permitted in fields already adequately served when new competition would increase cost and decrease efficiency.

Ports are really public utilities. Many of their activities and rates are governed by public utility regulations. In the present instance the addition of a new facility (port of Sacramento) would decrease the business of existing facilities and would increase their cost of operation and that of the ships serving the San Francisco Harbor area.

The Sacramento port project calls for digging a 30-mile deepwater channel through dry land and constructing from scratch a new inland port, all tributary to the harbor of San Francisco, at a present day cost as estimated by United States Army engineers, of $34 million.

There will be no saving to the public because the saving that would be realized by shippers is offset by increased costs to the vessel operator in traversing 180 miles of inland waterways to serve an additional port that would divert business from existing port facilities. The loss of tonnage by the ports serving this area now would increase their cost of operation and consequently the cost to the public.

The San Francisco Bay Harbor area, reached through Golden Gate Strait, is now adequately served by the port facilities of San Francisco, Oakland, Alameda, Richmond, Stockton, and Redwood City. These harbors already have from 25 to 50 percent more capacity than necessary to serve the demand for the foreseeable future.

If the port of Sacramento, 90 miles inland, is constructed, it can only gain tonnage at the expense of existing ports with increase of their deficits and probable deficit operation of the new port.

The fact that there is no urgency for an appropriation to begin the Sacramento project is shown by its estimated cost-benefit ratio. The Army Engineers estimate a ratio of 1.12 to 1. This is barely above minimum requirement and places the project very low on the list of approved projects.

Our engineers, shipping experts, and traffic men estimate the ratio at 0.53 to 1.

We urge that the budget should not be increased by adding an appropriation to begin the Sacramento project.

If this committee, however, believes that the project warrants consideration at this time we urge that before any action is taken the United States Engineers be requested to resurvey Sacramento's proposal through a public hearing so that at least there may be reconciled the difference between the engineers indication of a narrow benefit ratio and the existing port's view that there is a loss ratio.

Excerpts from the California Senate factfinding report and a résumé of the report of our port and traffic engineers are attached.

Excerpts From the Final Report of the California Senate Factfinding Committee on San Francisco Bay Ports

TONNAGE DROPPING, DEFICITS GROWING

Page 23

"The bay area's port facilities rank in quantity with the major United States harbors. There is need for improvement and modernization particularly at the port of San Francisco, but the total harbor facilities far exceed the present demands of port commerce. It is estimated that bay port facilities have the capacity for 25 percent to 50 percent more shipping than now flows through the harbor."

Page 35

"For the 20-year period, 1931 through 1950, the total income of the ports of San Francisco, Oakland, and Richmond amounted to $103,355,533. Total operating expenses were $61,730,650, leaving a net income of $41,624,883. Bond interest and a reasonable allowance for depreciation totaled $44,297,788. Hence, if these last items are taken into consideration, the 3 ports operated at a deficit of $2,672,905 for the 20-year period. This deficit is divided among the 3 ports as follows: San Francisco, $1,097,915; Oakland, $948,155; and Richmond, $546,835. The only years that total income of the ports was sufficient to cover operating expenses, bond interest, depreciation, etc., were the war years 1942 through 1945."

Page 36

"6. The total dry-cargo tonnage of all the ports has shown a tendency to decline during the past 20 years, except during the war years. Increased rates have only partially offset the effects of this decline. Oakland and Richmond have both increased their tonnage at the expense of San Francisco.

"There are no indications on the immediate horizon that this situation will be righted for the following reasons:

"(*a*) The downward trend, in all probability, will not be reversed except by constructive action on a harborwide basis.

"(*b*) The present international crisis, because it interferes with transpacific trade, will probably further reduce the tonnage moving over commercial docks. Military cargo will move over military installations."

Page 38

"The current shipping situation in San Francisco Harbor, insofar as it can be measured by tonnage, is due to a drop in dry-cargo traffic. The total traffic situation concerning oceangoing tonnage can be presented graphically by a few figures (in terms of thousand short tons):

	1925–40 average	1949	Net change	Percentage change
Dry cargo total	7,690	5,090	−2,600	−33.8
Foreign	2,205	2,281	+76	+3.4
Noncontiguous	1,273	1,309	+36	+2.0
Intercoastal	2,012	1,027	−985	−49.0
Coastwise	2,200	473	−1,727	−78.5

Page 51

"The extent to which maritime employment opportunities in San Francisco Bay have diminished since 1946 is evident from the following figures, which are an index of man-hours worked by longshoremen at Pacific coast ports (1946=100).

Year	Seattle	Portland	San Francisco	Los Angeles
1946	100	100	100	100
1947	99	128	112	128
1948	101	59	88	127
1949	107	71	77	158

"In 1949, the number of registered longshoremen in San Francisco was between 5,700 and 5,900. These men worked only 77 percent as many hours as had the longshoremen in 1946. In contrast, longshoremen at Seattle were enjoying more work hours for every 100 hours they had worked in 1946. Between 1948 and 1949, San Francisco Bay's share of total Pacific coast man-hours dropped from 46 percent to 38.8 percent."

Page 392

APPENDIX TABLE VII.—*Summary of foreign trade (volume), San Francisco Customs District, 1925–40 and 1946–49* [1]

[Thousand short tons]

Year	General exports	Lumber	Exports, including lumber	Bulk oil	Total exports	Total imports	Total trade
1925	1,277	154	1,431	883	2,314	883	3,197
1926	1,334	205	1,539	1,249	2,788	986	3,774
1927	1,324	229	1,553	1,070	2,623	976	3,579
1928	1,458	187	1,645	1,275	2,920	1,080	4,000
1929	1,561	220	1,781	1,118	2,900	[c] 1,053	3,953
1930	1,377	106	1,483	941	2,424	979	3,403
Average	1,388	184	1,572	1,089	2,660	993	3,654
1931	1,202	37	1,239	913	2,152	764	2,916
1932	983	37	1,020	1,183	2,204	[b] 679	2,883
1933	1,122	53	1,175	1,072	2,247	693	2,940
1934	1,023	62	1,085	979	2,065	758	2,823
1935	1,148	74	1,222	1,157	2,380	898	3,278
Average	1,096	53	1,148	1,061	2,210	758	2,968
1936	988	79	1,067	1,562	2,630	924	3,554
1937	1,234	94	1,328	1,875	3,203	1,124	4,327
1938	1,273	59	1,332	2,394	3,726	714	4,440
1939	1,230	78	1,308	2,279	3,587	611	4,198
1940	1,197	46	1,243	1,672	2,915	695	3,610
Average	1,184	71	1,256	1,956	3,212	814	4,026
1925–40 average [2]	1,233	108	1,341	1,351	2,692	864	3,556
1946	1,590	9	[c] 1,599	[d] 780	2,379	510	2,889
1947	1,575	26	[c] 1,601	[d] 1,125	2,726	737	3,463
1948	1,078	13	[c] 1,091	[d] 1,028	2,119	772	2,891
1949	1,366	27	[c] 1,393	[d] 512	1,904	983	2,887
Average	1,402	19	1,421	861	2,282	751	3,032

[1] Table compiled from annual reports issued by the board of State harbor commissioners, San Francisco, except as noted in footnotes (c) and (d) below. Export figures do not include reexports. For the years 1925 through 1930, Puerto Rico was included in a general category headed "Others" and until 1932, Samoa was apparently included in Oceania. Hence, through 1930, Puerto Rican trade is included in foreign rather than noncontiguous trade. The same is true of Samoa through 1931.

[2] 1941–45 war years omitted.

NOTE.—The figures for 1946 through 1949 include immediate transportation shipments.

[c] Imports of paper from Canada have been reduced 100,000 tons to correct an apparent error, as compared with Government figures.

[b] Imports of ores and mattes have been reduced by 350,000 tons to be more nearly in line with Government figures. An effort was made by the harbor commissioners in 1932 to use full weights instead of metal content.

[d] Total exports minus figures given for bulk oil shipments.

[d] Tanker Exports from U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Waterborne Trade by United States Port. Summary Reports, FT 972. For more detail on bulk-oil shipments, see appendix table XVIII.

Dry cargo moving through all San Francisco Bay ports, including tributary rivers

	1925–40 average (1,000 tons)	1949 (1,000 tons)	Net change (1,000 tons)	Percentage change	1953 (1,000 tons)	Net change, 1953 from 1925–40 average (1,000 tons)	Percentage change, 1953 from 1925–40
Trade route:							
Foreign	2,205	2,281	+76	+3.4	2,743	----------	----------
Noncontiguous	1,273	1,309	+36	+3.0	----------	----------	----------
Intercoastal	2,012	1,027	−985	−49.0	----------	----------	----------
Coastwise	2,200	473	−1,727	−78.5	[1] 2,278	----------	----------
Total	7,690	5,090	−2,600	−33.8	5,022	−2,668	−34.7

[1] A total for coastwise, intercoastal, and noncontiguous trades, not segregated.

Sources: 1925–40 average and 1949 figures—final report, Senate Fact Finding Committee on San Francisco Bay Ports, 1951 general session, California Legislature. 1953 figures, Waterborne Commerce of the United States, calendar year 1953, pt. IV, U. S. Army Engineers.

STATEMENT OF STOCKTON PORT DISTRICT ON THE SACRAMENTO SHIP CHANNEL

In January 1954, the district engineers submitted a revised report on this project. The revised report favored the resumption of the project. We feel there are several inherent economic fallacies present. The transportation benefits credited to the project are an important item, and the estimated potential tonnage used to arrive at these benefits is of extreme importance. Our estimate of the potential available deep draft commerce creditable to the project is as follows:

Commodity:	*Our estimated average (tons)*
Rice	175,000
Barley	100,000
Canned goods	150,000
Other outbound	60,000
All inbound	30,000
Predicted new	30,000
Total	545,000

Our estimates are arrived at after analysis of the individual commodities involved, the areas of their production, the method of their merchandising, and the trade routes involved.

Some comments regarding the individual commodities listed above follows.

Rice

Exhibit A attached shows the quantity of rice exported from the San Francisco customs district for the calendar years 1952 and 1953. For practical purposes, the San Francisco customs district will account for the total export movement of the entire California crop, and from exhibit A it will be noted that in 1952 the movement was 280,946 tons, and in 1953 the movement was 258,635 tons. It is significant to note that in both of these years the exports to Japan accounted for more than 50 percent of the total amount exported. In 1952 and 1953 it could be supposed that Stockton would handle most of the rice exports because of its closer proximity to the point of production. However, it is significant to note that in 1952 the movement to Japan from Stockton was only 80,000 tons, and in 1953 the movement to Japan from Stockton was 50,000 tons. From these figures it can readily be seen that proximity of a port to the producing area does not necessarily mean that that port can enjoy or handle the available traffic. Other economic and merchandising factors come into play. For example, there are two rice mills in San Francisco which draw their supplies from the same producing area. Rice mills in San Francisco would naturally move through terminals located in the San Francisco area. Additionally, experience shows that the manner in which the Japanese buyers have purchased California rice at times creates surge movements within a given period of time and, consequently, no single bulk terminal has the capacity to handle the volume of these surges and make the required shipping program.

The retention of the Japanese market is, of itself, a question mark. Prior to the war the amount of California rice merchandised in Japan was negligible, and the availability of the market today is due largely to unsettled trade routes in the Far East. As has been experienced in other commodities, if the Japanese buyers are able to procure their rice from closer sources at less cost, they will do so, and that market would be lost to the California producers. Obviously, any estimate of potential tonnage must properly recognize this feature. Other markets for California rice are not capable of picking up any slack. Since 1945 the rate of production of California rice has increased steadily, primarily due to the availability of the Japanese market. Indications are that it has reached its peak, and this is attested to by the fact that in the forthcoming year the production of rice is reduced on an acre-allocation basis due to overproduction in the 1954 season. For a port at Sacramento to realize an annual tonnage greater than we have estimated, there would have to be a heavy increase in California production, or the terminal facilities at Sacramento would have to be capable of driving all other northern California terminals out of business. Economic reasoning shows neither of these is a likelihood.

Barley

Exhibit B attached shows the exports of California barley from the San Francisco customs district for the calendar years of 1952 and 1953. These figures will represent practically all of the exports of California barley, and in their analysis it must be remembered that there is a considerable quantity of so-called coast barley produced in the coastal area below San Francisco.

It will be noted that Japan again, as in the case of rice, has been the largest buyer of California barley. In 1953, the next largest consumer of California barley was the Republic of Korea, who obtained approximately 32,000 tons for relief-feeding purposes. The exports to other countries is negligible, and has been since the war. Prior to World War II the principal export market for California barley was the United Kingdom, which imported malting barley. Since the war California barley has never been able to recapture this market against the competition of other countries, and whether or not it can do so in the future is questionable. Through the loss of this malting-barley market there has been a change in the type of barley produced in the State of California, with the emphasis on feed-type barley, which makes up the bulk of California barley production today. It is only proper that the export potential of California barley be explored in order to arrive at an honest evaluation of potential tonnage. The Japanese market for barley exists because barley is used for human consumption to supplement rice. In this connection, the Japanese have a preference for the lighter colored varieties of barley, and thus all varieties of California barley are not susceptible to exportation. On the other hand, Canadian barley is predominantly of the lighter varieties, and acceptable in the Japanese market. In the past, California barley has had an edge on Canadian barley to the degree occasioned by the fact that California barley is harvested earlier than Canadian barley, and thus the new crop is available sooner. In recent years, however, for reasons all of which are not known, California barley has experienced more and more competitive pressure from Canadian barley in the Japanese market, and, of course, has experienced additional competition from the increased production of rice. As in the case of rice, California barley today has a surplus crop, and world markets do not justify an increase in its production. The future of the Japanese market is a question mark, and unless the Federal Government embarks upon some foreign-assistance program, the entire export for California barley is not too bright.

In the estimated average of 100,000 tons, we have given the port of Sacramento most favorable treatment. It will be borne in mind that although they have a grain elevator constructed on the proposed deep water port site, there is a grain terminal in San Francisco, one in Oakland, and one at Stockton. In addition, there is under construction at Stockton a grain elevator with a capacity of 2 million bushels, and a capacity to deliver to ship at a rate far exceeding anything existing in California. The construction of the deep water port at Sacramento is no going to drive these other grain terminals out of existence because experience has shown that the construction at the port of Stockton did not cause the closing of grain terminals in Oakland and San Francisco because of the proprietary interest of grain dealers in such terminals. While it may divert some tonnage, it could never attract all of the business, and it is interesting to note that the the heavier production of barley is outside the Sacramento Valley area, and thus the freight rates would be more favorable to other grain terminals.

Canned goods

We believe that an estimated annual average of 150,000 tons of this commodity is giving the Sacramento project the benefit of considerable doubt. Any higher tonnage estimates that may have been used have been influenced by the location in the Sacramento area of some canneries capable of larger production. It must be borne in mind that canneries located outside the Sacramento Valley obtain their raw products from the same sources as do the Sacramento Valley canners. Thus, the Sacramento Valley canner has no toehold on the production in his area on any particular variety of canned fruits or vegetables. It must also be borne in mind that 3 of the 4 principal canners with plants in the Sacramento Valley also have a number of other plants located elsewhere in the State. This condition causes somewhat of a specialization in the varieties of food products packed in any given plant, and results in the consolidation of the various varieties into one single location in order to have a complete line of items available to fill mixed orders. Thus, what would appear to be potential tonnage because it is canned in Sacramento, is not rightfully so,

because it may be withdrawn to other areas for shipment with goods packed at other plants.

It is important to note also that one of the largest of the Sacramento canneries also owns and operates its own marine terminal in Alameda, Calif., and although from a freight rate standpoint it is presently more economical for them to ship their Sacramento production to Stockton, instead, they move heavy tonnages from Sacramento to their Alameda terminal where the loss in freight is offset by earnings of the marine terminal operation, plus the fact that they obtain the benefits of the consolidation process outlined above. It should also be pointed out that while there has been a substantial increase in the canning of California fruits and vegetables, there has been a correspondingly heavy increase in Pacific coast population, and the increase in canning has been largely to take care of the increased west coast markets.

All inbound cargo

We estimate that a reasonable annual average of inbound cargo would not exceed 30,000 tons. Our conclusions are reached after careful analysis of the experiences of the port of Stockton where there is presently no competition for this traffic from a port at Sacramento. Despite the absence of competition, however, the facts are that the amount of inbound cargo handled by the port of Stockton for consumption by the Sacramento area is negligible, and the construction of a port at Sacramento would not appreciably change the situation. The movement of heavy steel and manufacturing plants to the Pacific coast has lessened any possibility of increased inbound waterborne products to the Sacramento area. These plants are moving west solely to serve the Pacific slope.

Predicted new tonnage

Any predicted new tonnage is certainly an arbitrary allowance. The dry cargo movements through all San Francisco Bay ports and tributary rivers, shown for the period of 1925–40 compared with the year 1953, reflects a decline of 2,668,000 tons, or a drop of 34 percent, as quoted in the Senate Fact Finding Committee of the State of California on San Francisco Bay Ports, 1951, General Session, California Legislature, and 1953 figures of the Waterborne Commerce of the United States, published by the United States Army engineers.

Deep draft transportation savings creditable to the project

To determine the transportation savings on deep draft tonnage creditable to the project, a unit savings per ton must be determined.

Of course, there will be savings realized by the shipper in many instances in the form of lower inland freight rates. On the other hand, however, these are offset by an added expense to the vessel operator for sending a ship from San Francisco to Sacramento, and return. Our investigation shows that the daily cost for all vessels, foreign or domestic, averages $3,000 per day, and that 24 hours will be used in steaming time, exclusive of loading time at Sacramento. Investigations of the records of the port of Stockton shows that in 1953, 54 percent of the loadings did not exceed 2,500 tons per vessel. The same records in 1954 show that 67 percent of the loadings were less than 2,500 tons per vessel. Therefore, an average loading of 2,500 tons per vessel would be most favorable to the Sacramento project. The resulting mathematical calculations determine the vessel operators' per ton cost to be $1.20 per ton, which cost must apply against savings that would be realized in inland freight transportation.

After analyzing the available savings in inland transportation, and applying against these the vessel operating costs, we determine the net per ton saving creditable to the project to average 48 cents per ton.

Conclusion

The foregoing material and the conclusions we submit are based upon 23 years of experience with an intimate knowledge of the territory, the commodities involved and the trades in which they move, and with proper knowledge of local transportation characteristics.

Our study shows the conclusions reached by the United States engineers, as reflected in the testimony in the hearings on H. R. 8367 before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, 83d Congress, 2d session, are vulnerable from several approaches. The conclusions reached by the United States engineers as referred to above, were as follows:

Total average annual benefits	$1,810,000
Total annual cost benefits	$1,612,000
Benefit-cost ratio	1.12 to 1.0

After study, we find a more realistic estimate of the annual benefits and costs develops a ratio of only 0.53 to 1.0 as shown below:

Transportation benefits:	
Deep draft	$260,100
Shallow draft	310,000
Subtotal	570,100
Flood control	122,000
Delta Island reclamation	115,000
Savings in flood control project costs	40,000
Total average annual benefits	847,100
Total annual cost	1,612,000
Deficiency	764,900
Benefit-cost ratio	0.53 to 1.0

EXHIBIT A.—*Exports of rice from San Francisco Customs District*

CALENDAR YEAR 1953

To—	*Tons*
Hawaii	30,299
Puerto Rico	86,747
Other countries	141,589
Total	258,635
Japan only	134,762

CALENDAR YEAR 1952

To—	
Hawaii	26,614
Puerto Rico	98,800
Other countries	155,532
Total	280,946
Japan only	142,440

Source: Board of State Harbor Commissioners for San Francisco Harbor.

EXHIBIT B.—*Exports of barley from San Francisco Customs District*

	Tons
Calendar year 1953	174,613
Japan only	140,710
Calendar year 1952	291,653
Japan only	206,359

NOTE.—Includes rye.
Source: San Francisco Harbor Board.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

THE SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL

WITNESSES

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GEORGE LODI, PRESIDENT, FARMERS' RICE GROWERS COOPERATIVE
T. H. RICHARDS, JR., ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER AND DIRECTOR, BERCUT-RICHARDS PACKING CO.
HARRY FINKS, CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR
CHARLES W. DETERDING, COUNTY MANAGER, SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CALIF.
E. A. BAHNFLETH, VICE MAYOR, CITY OF SACRAMENTO, CALIF.
LEWIS H. DAY, GENERAL MANAGER, GREATER SACRAMENTO (CALIF.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
W. G. STONE, PORT DIRECTOR AND GENERAL MANAGER OF THE SACRAMENTO-YOLO PORT DISTRICT

Mr. EVINS. We are delighted to see you, our colleague, and to hear from you, Mr. Moss.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Chairman, on the matter of time, we will try to stay very carefully within the limits set by the committee.

I would like at this point to file statements from my colleague, Congressman Clair Engle of the Second District, a statement from Mr. Weston B. Grimes, of Cargill, Inc., and a statement from Mr. Timothy Dillon, Washington representative of the Sacramento-Yolo Port project.

This is a project authorized by Congress in 1946. A port district was created under State law to operate the port. The district has voted bonds totaling $3¾ million in order to meet the clear commitments it made in the agreement with the Army engineers for its participation in the construction of the project and the maintenance and building of facilities. We feel very much in the position of a man who, in good faith, has entered into a contract, has performed every condition that was imposed by the contract, even exceeding the actual requirements in an effort to cooperate and to fulfill, in good faith, his obligation. The Congress has appropriated $2,566,308 which has been spent by the Federal Government. The State of California originally appropriated three-quarters of a million dollars for use in acquiring rights of way for this projects. The State has additionally constructed certain highway access facilities for the port and to date the State's expenditure is $1,058,000. Port district bonds totaling $1,750,000 have been expended for facilities as required by the agreement. We have acquired most of the rights of way, and we have the property lines determined for the district to go out and wind up its part in acquiring the rest of the property.

Last year, the engineers used $67,000 of funds which were loaned by the port district under an agreement approved by the Bureau of the Budget a number of years ago. I think the total loan at that time was $500,000. We are committed to this project. There is no way that the local district can cease at this point. The project has been restudied with great care by the engineers. I would like at this time

to put into the record a letter from Brig. Gen. E. C. Itschner sent March 3 this year and commenting on an inquiry made by me on a point raised by the very small group in the State opposing the project. And after a careful review, General Itschner states the justification stands up just as strongly as it did at the time of original authorization.

It is my view that the opposition to the project was considered carefully by the Congress at that time. I might point out that the gentleman representing the Sacramento-Yolo Port area at the time of the original authorization was the present Congressman from the city of Stockton, Hon. Leroy Johnson. Mr. Johnson fought hard for this project before the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of the House. In his testimony, and I am prepared to make available to the committee copies of that testimony, he firmly backed the economic justification of the project. We feel now that the continued delay works a rather severe penalty upon local interests who have fulfilled every requirement imposed on them by the Congress in the original authorization act.

We have collected over $1 million in taxes. We are going to continue to collect taxes year in and year out for many years. There is no way we can avoid it. The continued withholding of lands, the continued tying up of investments there, is unquestionably unjustified. I might point out that local interests have constructed improvements for the proper functioning of a port, with a total investment of around $3½ million in facilities which would not have been constructed except in anticipation of the Government going through with its commitment on this project.

Mr. EVINS. Tell us what facilities have been built there in anticipation.

Mr. Moss. Warehousing and rice storage and milling facilities.

Mr. EVINS. Private industry?

Mr. Moss. Private industry.

Mr. EVINS. Private industry is prepared to continue to expend substantial sums of money?

Mr. Moss. We have representatives here today who will very briefly outline some of those plans to you. But for the press of time they could go into much greater detail. We are actually at this moment left holding the bag on this deal. It is one of the few projects—in fact, I think I would be safe in saying it is the only project—that Congress authorized, started, required substantial local participation but was suspended because of the Korean conflict and work has not been resumed. The Engineers have supported the economic justification of the project. In fact, General Itschner accompanied me to a meeting with the Bureau of the Budget last fall. Both of the Senators from California have worked hard to try to get work resumed on this project. Last year the Senators succeeded in having included in the appropriation bill on the Senate side funds for the completion of the planning; that was knocked out in conference. The California State Legislature unanimously this year memorialized the Congress, again requesting that we resume work on this project. You also will have read to you a telegram from the Governor.

It is a project which enjoys widespread support in the State and the full support of the people in the area. It serves one of the most

rapidly growing areas in this Nation, an area that has real need for low-cost transportation.

Mr. EVINS. Briefly, could you tell us how much the city of Sacramento has expended thus far and how much the State of California?

Mr. MOSS. The State of California has expended $1,058,000. The port district which is the legal body that operates the port has voted bonds to the extent of $3¾ million and have expended from those funds approximately $1¾ million. The Federal Government has expended $2,566,000.

Mr. EVINS. I thank you for your statement.

Mr. MOSS. I would like to have permission to extend my remarks in the record.

Mr. EVINS. You may have that permission.

Mr. HAND. What is the present benefit-cost ratio estimated by the engineers?

Mr. MOSS. 1.12, substantially the same as at the time of the authorization.

That does not include a very important military benefit as a result of Mather and McClellan Fields in the area and the Sacramento Signal Depot. That has been unevaluated.

I would like to introduce Mr. George Lodi.

Mr. JENSEN. If this channel is made navigable to Sacramento as proposed, will it bring greater water-transportation revenue than now exists?

Mr. MOSS. Definitely.

Mr. JENSEN. Why?

Mr. MOSS. Well, we have lost in recent years——

Mr. JENSEN. Not for the port of Sacramento but for the entire water transportation ports in that area, will it bring greater revenue? I understand there are now six ports in that area, or along the Pacific coast, which heavy ships enter. In your opinion, do you have facts and figures to prove that if this channel is deepened as it is proposed to Sacramento, that the overall revenue for oceangoing transportation be increased?

Mr. MOSS. The overall revenue or the benefit?

Mr. JENSEN. The overall revenue for all oceangoing transportation. It has been testified to here that if this port is added to the other ports, that it only will take business from the other ports who are now just beginning to get in the black and if the Sacramento port is added the other ports such as Stockton, stand to lose money or go in the red as well as your Sacramento port.

Mr. MOSS. It will increase revenue, Mr. Jensen; it will not depend upon taking away or diverting from Stockton or any other inland port tonnage in order to make the project economically justified. That is borne out by the report of the engineers. I think it is one of the conditions which they imposed upon a project.

Mr. JENSEN. You say it will not take business from Stockton?

Mr. MOSS. It will not divert from Stockton any major tonnage.

Mr. JENSEN. Doesn't the Stockton port get tonnage from as far north as Sacramento? And farther north?

Mr. MOSS. A small amount. It is not major tonnage. I think one of the very firm requirements of the engineers is that a project must, without detriment to other projects, be able to stand on its own feet

economically. This project will, and we will be very happy to supply supporting data for that statement.

Mr. EVINS. You think it will not tend to put such ports as Stockton in the red?

Mr. Moss. I would forecast continued increased tonnage for Stockton with this project in operation.

Mr. JENSEN. How would you say that could come about?

Mr. Moss. There is an awful lot of agricultural produce that does not move through the port of Stockton from the valleys. It does not move by water now but would move by water if this project were in operation.

Mr. JENSEN. That would be to the detriment of trucklines, would it not?

Mr. Moss. They have interposed no objection. I might point out that this resolution that passed our State legislature went through without objection when the senator from Stockton was sitting in the senate and the assemblyman from Stockton was sitting in the State assembly. Had they felt there would be any detrimental effect on Stockton, I think they would have quickly taken exception to the resolution.

When I say that we had a very small group opposing this, I mean it. It is a very small group.

Mr. JENSEN. All right.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed by introducing your other witnesses.

Mr. Moss. Mr. George Lodi, the president of the Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative.

Mr. LODI. Gentlemen, in a report published as Senate Document 142, 79th Congress, the Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, recommended construction of the Sacramento River deep water channel. Electors in the Sacramento-Yolo port district by an election held on April 15, 1947, gave assurances of local obligations. Further, the State of California, in July 1947, gave like assurance. Such actions served to convince the board of directors of Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative that the project would be ultimately completed. Accordingly, our company chose to erect an expensive rice drier and storage facility and mill within this growing area on the assumption that industrial property in that area would be serviced by the channel.

In late 1953, Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative constructed a million-dollar rice drying and storage facility in the Sacramento-Yolo district adjacent to the proposed deep water channel project. We are now in the process of further expansion in the erection of a $1,200,000 rice mill adjoining the storage and drying facility to be completed in October 1955.

The California rice industry produces annually from 10 million to 12½ million bags of paddy rice. Eighty-five percent of the rice cultivation is represented in acreage from Sacramento northward some 300 miles and is shipped via water to our principal markets for California rice, namely Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Japan.

The California rice industry is highly mechanized. The planting, fertilizing of rice was first introduced in California. Harvesting, milling, and processing methods have been improved and developed immeasurably during the past several years. This means that we have been able to channel our product to the consumer on a competitive basis in our domestic, territorial and world markets.

To maintain this advantage, we must look to our transportation costs. Water transportation is the answer and the Sacramento-Yolo port district offers facilities for which we, as well as other allied industries, are in great need. The Sacramento-Yolo port area can be the hub of common carrier transportation in the Sacramento Valley.

From an agricultural standpoint, California has been in an enviable position in relation to rice during the past several years. The California crop has been milled and marketed with no carryover posing a problem for the USDA or the Commodity Credit Corporation, thereby saving taxpayers millions of dollars.

To remain in this healthy position, we must remain competitive in a competitive industry. As president of this cooperative, we urge your aid to include in the 1955–56 budget necessary moneys to complete the deep water channel in the Sacramento-Yolo port district. I will insert my prepared statement at this point.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF GEORGE E. LODI, PRESIDENT, FARMERS' RICEGROWERS COOPERATIVE IN SUPPORT OF THE SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER CHANNEL PROJECT

My name is George E. Lodi. I am appearing here as president of the Farmers' Ricegrowers Cooperative, San Francisco, Calif., in support of funds for the resumption of construction on the Sacramento River deepwater channel project.

I am a native Californian, having spent all of my life there and most of it in the Sacramento Valley. I have been a member of State reclamation board since 1943, am chairman of the California Flood Control Conference—and am a director of the Agriculture Council of California, an organization of cooperatives which markets hundreds of millions of dollars worth of agricultural products, poultry and livestock. I have been farming for over 30 years.

The marketing of agricultural products is a challenge to our ingenuity and rice is no exception. It is highly competitive and a product consumed mostly by the lower income group. Approximately 85 percent of our markets are offshore—Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and export. Since we operate in an area that pays the highest of wage scales, it is vital that economical methods of handling our commodity be used. Transportation is a most important factor in our economy and thus very essential to the well-being of our industry.

As farmers, we have taken advantage of every opportunity to reduce our operating costs. We have mechanized extensively, eliminating much expensive and slow hand labor. The Sacramento River deepwater channel would be most effective in the reduction of fertilizer transportation costs from the Atlantic to the Pacific for which on 2 carloads in 1954 I paid $20 per ton rail freight.

As you have seen, I have confined my statements to one commodity leaving to others who are more familiar with many other commodities that would use these port facilities reaching into many thousands of tons.

The Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative is made up of some 250 members from all of the rice-producing counties of the State. We assumed that the Federal Government meant what it said, that it would construct this project if State and local interests upheld their part of the deal. We accepted the deferment of appropriations during the national emergency, but to further delay funds for construction if only to protect the $2.5 million you have now invested would be unjustifiable. I have been informed that the State and local interests have fulfilled their obligations; if this be true and I am confident it is, do we not have the right to expect the Federal Government to do likewise?

If the people interested in this project do not have this right then they should be fully and promptly advised of the reasons. This delay has now gone on too long. As a taxpayer in this port district, our organization is subject to taxes to amortize and carry on the existing bond issue and without completing this project there is no opportunity to collect any revenue, and a port district without facilities or channel is worthless. May your better judgment see the true light of the facts and that you immediately recommend the funds the Corps of Engineers can use now and continue to make funds available for its early completion. I cannot emphasize too strongly that the confidence our board of directors had

in the knowledge of the agreements to construct the port project at an early date made the selection of a site near these intended facilities more attractive. The possibility of an overhead conveyor from our processing plant to shipside is only one item that lends to the attraction. The assurance given us by port district officials that approximately 1,000 acres of land had been acquired by them for use as a turning basin, area for wharves and docks, transit heads, warehouses, and other port facilities convinced our board of directors of their sincerity. These and other advantages were the convincing facts that determined our expenditures up to now in excess of $2 million for drying, storage, and milling facilities.

The natural facilities contributing to the assurance that rice will continue to be produced in the area to be served by these port facilities, are an abundant water supply, land and irrigation development by local interests extending into many millions of dollars. Climatic conditions are well adapted to the production of rice. Other hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested locally for drying and storing facilities to care for rice from the field. Rice is one of the major field crops in the State of California, contributing materially to its economic welfare, creating much employment, and further, it has moved into commercial channels and not into Government storage. Approximately 85 percent of California rice is produced in the area to be served by these port facilities, and approximately 80 percent of the processing facilities of rice are within this area and would make use of them.

It is my understanding that the Corps of Engineers have stated that they can advantageously expend $2 million on construction work on this project in the next fiscal year. I urgently urge you to make an appropriation in that amount.

To review, it was very definitely a factor that convinced our board of directors to expend this amount of money in drying facilities, storage facilities, milling facilities, and it is adjacent to the port whereby we can also erect a conveyor to shipside, if necessary. On the grounds that we felt that it was definitely a binding and solemn obligation, these directors, inasmuch as rice is a commodity that needs cheap transportation—I am quite interested in the question the Congressman asked Congressman Moss insofar as the development of business is concerned. I am convinced that it is going to develop more business there, Congressman, because there is a great deal of these agricultural commodities that would not go to Stockton because of the proximity of other ports. Lumbering interests of the northern part of the State would not, in my judgment, select Stockton in preference to Oakland, San Francisco, and certainly they would not go to Stockton. All that area, 20 counties or more in the area that would serve, it would seem to me to be more interested in the facilities at Sacramento than those at Stockton.

There is another phase that we hesitate to mention. As you know, California's highways are pretty well cluttered up with traffic. The more truck traffic we can remove from our highways, in my judgment, would minimize many of the traffic hazards that we happen to have in California at the moment. It seems to me that inasmuch as California's economy is more or less built up on truck and water transportation, the development of this channel, in my judgment, is going to expand water transportation further upstream above the facilities of the deepwater channel. The oil companies are now establishing facilities upstream from Sacramento where they are transporting their product for distribution farther up on into the State of California and also into Oregon and Washington from there, using river ports for distributing points.

Gentlemen, not to presume too much on your time, I think that the point that I want to emphasize and want to emphasize very

strongly is the fact that we did feel and are convinced that we felt this was a solemn and binding obligation between the Commonwealth of the State of California, the Sacramento Port District, and the Federal Government. My experience as a member of the State reclamation board, who has served on there since 1943, the experience I have had in working with congressional committees that appear annually in support of appropriations for flood-control projects, those agreements, those understandings, those contracts, again are a mutual agreement between the State of California and the Federal Government, and we have yet to see one, though, that has had its authorization discontinued.

We can readily go along with the deferment of the appropriation of funds during the national emergency. But we feel now that the delay has gone on too long, and in my feeling I would like to urge my sincere appeal to you that you make available the amount of money that the Corps of Engineers can readily spend at the moment or advantageously spend at the moment, and to continue to make continuing appropriation until the completion of the project.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Lodi, it has been indicated that a greater portion of this would be dredging of an entirely new channel. Would it go along the river stream?

Mr. LODI. A new channel, using connecting sloughs and canals, Mr. Congressman. The old river channel is rather crooked and meandering. The new channel is going to shorten the distance approximately 15 miles, I understand. I don't have all the details of that, but Mr. Stone, port district director, does have all of those details. But it is an entirely new route, using connecting waterways for a deepwater channel after leaving the river above Rio Vista.

Mr. EVINS. When was this compact or agreement entered into initially between the harbor district, the State of California, and the Federal Government?

Mr. LODI. July of 1947, the State of California by action of the legislature in California passed their approval.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Tom Richards of the Bercut-Richards Packing Co. might answer that.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am T. H. Richards, Jr., assistant general manager and director of the Bercut-Richards Packing Co. We process upward of 2½ million cases of canned foods in Sacramento. In 1954, we shipped 18,500 tons by water to the Atlantic Seaboard. We have been vitally interested in getting the port completed. We are quite a large taxpayer in the district. The port district is well along with their taxing program for everyone in the district. We have lost our European market. However, our sales manager is over there now and when we get the Sacramento Port completed we feel we could recover that lost business thereby developing new tonnage. Also, there are 4 other large canners in Sacramento and 2 north of Sacramento that would use the facilities of the Sacramento Port. If there are any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

(The following was submitted later:)

BERCUT-RICHARDS PACKING CO.
Sacramento, Calif.

Bercut-Richards Packing Co. are packers of canned fruits and vegetables. Our firm packed 2,528,000 cases during 1954 with a gross shipping weight of 60,682 tons.

We individually are producing canned goods for worldwide markets but have been handicapped in reaching large centers of population on the Atlantic and gulf coasts due to the cancellation on October 1, 1952, of terminal intercoastal rates from Sacramento to the Atlantic coast. We have been compelled to either forego some of this desirable business or to arrange between the buyer and ourselves to stand the extra costs of reaching shipside at more distant ports. During the year 1954, we shipped 18,568 short tons to the eastern ports by water. The Sacramento deepwater channel is absolutely necessary and, in fact, is a "must" if we are to market our product economically on a worldwide basis.

The Sacramento can manufacturing plant of the Continental Can Co. is located across the street from our plant and manufactures tin cans for our use. They also manufacture tin cans for many other canneries and food processing plants in the Sacramento area. Cans require thousands of tons of tin plate which could move via deepwater channel in intercoastal commerce from the tin plate manufacturing plants on or near the Atlantic and gulf coasts. This traffic lends itself to water transportation and is highly desirable intercoastal cargo.

We are a heavy taxpayer both to the Federal Government and on local port district taxes. Our port district has purchased a substantial acreage of farmland for conversion to a deepwater terminal area and for future channel development. We have been paying taxes on these rights-of-way since 1950 but we are without the economic benefits which would accrue from completion of the deepwater channel project.

We strongly urge your honorable committee to make an appropriation for resumption of construction of this project for the next fiscal year.

T. H. RICHARDS, Jr.,
Assistant General Manager and Director.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Richards.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Harry Finks.

Mr. FINKS. My name is Harry Finks. In addition to representing the California State Federation of Labor which urges an appropriation for the Sacramento Yolo deepwater channel, California's Governor, Goodwin J. Knight, has asked me to express his interest in resuming the project.

I understand Governor Knight sent a telegram to the chairman to emphasize the fact that the State of California is vitally interested in completing the Sacramento-Yolo port project. I would appreciate it if the telegram can be included in the record.

We feel there is no economy in continued suspension of the deepwater channel which was delayed by the Korean war. The war was a proper reason for temporary suspension of construction. There is no such reason for failure to resume work at this time.

This project is an investment in the Nation's strength in the fields of defense, industry, and agriculture. It certainly is no pork-barrel project. To delay resumption of the project any longer is to throw away an important investment the Federal Government, the State of California and the people in the Sacramento area have made in the Nation's future.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Finks. The telegram you referred to says:

Regret my Washington schedule prevents my appearing personally on behalf of appropriation for Sacramento River deepwater channel project. My administration has consistently supported this project and I take this means of indicat-

ing my continued favorable interest and the need for prompt action on further appropriation for a project which will have a most favorable economic effect throughout northern California.

It is signed, "Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California."

Mr. Moss. Mr. Deterding is the county executive of Sacramento County, Calif.

Mr. DETERDING. My name is Charles Deterding. I am the county manager of Sacramento County, Calif. I have been sent to this meeting by the county board of supervisors. I have a resolution from the board of supervisors that I would like to submit for the record and a brief statement that I would like to submit for the records.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF CHARLES W. DETERDING, COUNTY EXECUTIVE SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CALIF.

In 1946 the Congress passed a Public Law 525 authorizing the construction by the Federal Government of the Sacramento deepwater channel. A provision of the act required participation by the local interests. In conformity with this stipulation the Sacramento-Yolo port district was legally organized under State law. A bond issue for $3,750,000 was voted to carry out the obligation of the local community.

In addition, the State of California appropriated $750,000 toward the project. The Federal Government likewise made an appropriation to start construction and project seemed to be on its way to completion.

The Korean war came along and all projects were temporarily closed down. We concurred in this program in view of the national emergency.

Now that we no longer are involved in aggressive military operations away from home the local community feels that in view of the fact the port district has in good faith complied with all the requirements of the congressional provisions of the authorization, the committee should recommend an appropriation to start construction of the channel.

Sacramento is growing very rapidly; our industrial development is expanding at a tremendous rate. The demand for deepwater transportation facilities is constantly increasing. The 10-foot channel of the Sacramento River is no longer adequate to meet the needs of the Sacramento Valley. In addition, the rearrangement of the Sacramento River to fit into the central Sacramento project will necessitate the installation of locks in the lower Sacramento River. This will greatly inconvenience navigation on the river, and therefore, it is imperative that the Sacramento Channel be constructed at an early date.

The business interest and the citizens in the Sacramento Valley generally are interested in this project and it is our hope that you will see fit to find a way to help get the project started.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, our county government feels that this hearing is important enough to send me all the way from the west coast to appear before this committee to make this brief statement.

You know, I am sure, that upon authorization by the Congress by Public Law 525 in 1946, the local community proceeded in good faith to comply with all the requirements of the act creating the project. The local interests have assumed financial responsibility by issuing obligation bonds to comply with the requirements of the act.

The State of California has also provided funds. The Federal Government has contributed funds to start the construction. Our request is that you make appropriations so that the construction be continued.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr. Moss. Mr. E. A. Bahnfleth, vice mayor, city of Sacramento, Calif.

Mr. BAHNFLETH. I have a written statement that I would like to enter into the record if I may and briefly wish to say that the people of

Sacramento are anxiously awaiting the completion of this work. They have been promised that it would be done, by the city, the State, and by Federal officials. I earnestly urge you to include in your appropriation enough to get this work started again. Thank you.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF MR. E. A. BAHNFLETH, VICE MAYOR, CITY OF SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

The city of Sacramento is an important wholesale distribution and manufacturing center. We have several hundred wholesale distributors who buy merchandise and raw materials from eastern manufacturing centers on or near the Atlantic and gulf seaports. Prior to cancellation of intercoastal terminal rates, a substantial tonnage of this character was shipped by water to our Sacramento wholesalers, using our municipal wharf for handling of this cargo.

Three of the world's largest fruit and vegetable canneries are located within the Sacramento city limits, one on the outskirts and a fifth large soup and vegetable juice plant also located on the outskirts of our city. Within our city limits we have the world's largest almond processing plant, also a rice plant. We have numerous other large manufacturing plants of a wide variety in our metropolitan area.

Cancellation of intercoastal rates on October 1, 1952, by intercoastal carriers stopped a substantial movement of tonnage eastbound over our Sacramento municipal wharves. In fact, it took 200,000 tons of general cargo off the Sacramento River during the last 3 months of 1952.

Our people voted bonds to participate in the construction of the deepwater channel project. We voted those bonds depending upon the Federal Government to do the dredging of the channel as authorized in 1946. Our local people have fulfilled their obligation under the act of authorization and have even gone much further than required.

The cost of reaching shipside at more distant ports in California is too great. The only solution of this shipping problem is to complete the deepwater channel project which the Federal Government started in 1949.

As a representative of the city of Sacramento, I urge your committee to appropriate $2 million in the budget pending before you so as to enable the Corps of Engineers to resume construction.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Lewis H. Day.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am Lewis H. Day, general manager of the Greater Sacramento, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, an organization composed of more than 2,000 business and professional people.

It is our belief that the original plan was economically feasible. We still believe, after the recent survey by the Army engineers, that it is an economically sound project. We believe, however, that it is extremely wasteful for the Federal Government to continue to let this project remain in an uncompleted state. The millions of dollars already spent by both Federal and local agencies will be wasted unless the project is completed.

Our need, from a business point of view, can be pointed up, I think, quite simply by telling you that on this 3-week trip of mine from California through the Middlewest and East, I have talked with the top executives of two nationally known concerns which have plans to build west coast manufacturing plants. In each case, I was asked: "What is the status of the port project?" In each case the spokesmen for these two firms said flatly: "Your part of California has a strong appeal for us. Frankly, we would not be hesitant if we could be assured that your port project would be completed in a reasonable length of time."

As you all know, California is growing at a tremendous rate and we must provide, in some way, jobs for those thousands of newcomers.

Completion of the Sacramento-Yolo port project would enhance our opportunities to provide the jobs that are badly needed.

Thank you for the time allotted us. Your serious consideration of our problem, which is immediate, is deeply appreciated.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Day.

Mr. Moss. The final witness, Mr. Chairman, is the director of the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, Mr. W. G. Stone.

Mr. STONE. I am port director and general manager of the Sacramento-Yolo Port District. I will file my statement with the committee to be included in the record. I will touch upon a few of the points. I will answer some of the questions which were asked of the others. The project was authorized in 1946. It calls for a channel 30 feet deep and 200 feet bottom width and is 15 miles shorter than the existing river but it uses connecting sloughs and waterways deepening a drainage canal for some 18 or 20 miles from 9 feet in depth to 30 feet and widening and straightening those waterways.

This is the engineers' official drawing. [pointing to drawing.] The area shown in red is where the Corps of Engineers in 1949 threw up retaining levees to establish harbor lines. The other area in red is the Cache Slough area. That area, 4 miles in length, has been completed to project width and depth. The remainder from this point over to about that point would cut across the west side of Prospect Island. Then it follows the drainage canal all the way up to this point, thence a 2-mile cut-across from that point to Lake Washington. That, I think, will clear up some of the doubts in the minds of some people. We are utilizing the river to this point, Cache Slough to this point, straightening these bends out. That is the general route. I leave this official map with the committee for its use.

Now, let me indicate this: Immediately after the project was authorized in 1946, the port district was organized within 8½ months on April 15, 1947. The State of California approved the project 11½ months afterward and made an appropriation. Port bonds were voted within 15½ months on November 4, 1947. Agreement of assurance was made on December 24, 1947, 17 months after authorization. I have a copy of that agreement of assurance and ask, Mr. Chairman, that it be included in the record. Six weeks later, the Secretary of the Army accepted it. On February 3, 1948. I will ask that this acceptance be included in the record.

Now, the first construction appropriation was made by Congress in 1948, construction was started in 1949 contemplating completion in about 4 years which would have been about mid-1953. Based upon that splendid start the port district sold its bonds, bought rights-of-way and constructed a grain elevator, 500,000-bushel capacity. In was designed for deep sea transportation. The arrow pointing to that square on the headhouse, that opening was designed for overhead conveyor of grain from and to shipside (see appendix 5 in my prepared statement). For 5 long years we have been unable to use our elevator except by railroad and highway. Our lessee, the Kerr-Gifford Co., now part of Cargill's organization, has been confining this operation wholly to rail and highway transportation, deprived of the benefit of water transportation.

Now, as to the present channel, 10-foot channel, it is no longer adequate to meet our needs. I hand you a tabulation of tonnage from 1941 through 1953 showing the tremendous drop in the general cargo

from about 700,000 tons to a little less than 500,000 tons in 1952 after the intercoastal carriers canceled terminal rates by transshipment. They could not send their deep sea ships to Sacramento. This took 210,000 tons of general cargo off the river that year. It has been dropping continuously since that time. I would ask that this tabulation be included in the record.

The State of California—Congressman Moss has referred to the Joint Resolution 11. I presume that will be included in the record but to make sure, I have a copy of it here which I think should be included in the record.

The port district bought 971 acres of land in 1949. We have spoil disposal rights on an additional 380 acres in this area, and on the other side of the lake over here [pointing to photograph]. The port district owns this property from the river over to Lake Washington, to this point there. All along that area there, a total of 971 areas plus spoil disposal on an additional 380 acres.

The port district highway comes out in this general manner around the port district grain elevator. The port district belt railroad connecting with all Sacramento railroads comes here. Mr. Lodi's rice mill is at this point. This is his elevator constructed last year. This is a 5-story rice mill under construction at the present time. When that facility is completed at the end of the year, he will have an investment there of two and a quarter million dollars.

The Sacramento district engineer did not have sufficient funds available to provide all the specifications necessary to enable us to purchase rights-of-way. We authorized the use of $67,000 of port district money for preparation of these plans. He has used that money very advantageously and has given us the necessary information. We are now engaged in purchasing and condemning the rights-of-way. If Federal funds are made available on the first of July, the district engineer could advertise for bids and make awards, contracts sufficient to spend $2 million during the next fiscal year. We urge that that amount be made available.

Now then, as to the investment of local interests, I doubt if there is any other river harbor project in the United States where local interests have taken hold of their project so promptly and wholeheartedly as we have. On page two of my presentation you will find the details there.

I will summarize in this manner: The total amount required by the act of authorization, we have spent and committed a total of $3,120,830. But from local work done but not required yet actually done, we have expended $3,458,000. That makes a total of $6,578,830 local investment by the State, port district, and private money. The Federal Government has expended $2,566,308. In other words, the local interests have spent 72 percent and the Federal Government 28 percent of that which has been done.

Now, as to new cargo which might be developed, this project will develop new and additional industry for a distance of about 20 miles along the channel paralleled by a railroad and a State highway. Many of those new industries with their private wharves will develop wholly new traffic. In addition to that, I may call your attention to this map I have here and which I leave for consideration by your committee. You asked as to why other ports could not handle our traffic.

This map divides California, Northern Nevada, and Southern Oregon into port zone areas depending upon the land transportation cost to California ports. The Sacramento River flows down the Sacramento Valley this way to Sacramento—the whole area in northern California is tributary to Sacramento. It costs more to ship to Stockton or bay ports than it does to Sacramento from the Sacramento area. This Sacramento area has been held back in development as Mr. Lodi indicated in lumber and other commodities. In this area near Shasta Dam there are 80 million tons of iron ore core drilled in the past several months in this Shasta Dam area; that could move down for industrial development in this general area along the deep water channel or for export.

Does Stockton serve that area more economically than the Bay ports? No. The State of California owns and operates the port of San Francisco. The State of California by legislative action and through our Governor is supporting our port development. The State of California does not object to development of the Sacramento port.

Gentlemen, I could go on and on and cover a vast amount of other data but I think——

Mr. EVINS. You support the position of Mr. Moss and the gentlemen of the chamber of commerce that substantial tonnage would be developed and increased and it would not result in damage to Stockton or other ports?

Mr. STONE. That's right. When Stockton was created, the same argument was advanced. Stockton has developed and is handling substantial tonnage; 341 ships called there last year and I know more than half the tonnage moving in deep sea ships loaded over 3,000 tons per ship. This area of ours has been held back because of high transportation cost to and from ships in reaching market. We can't reach the more distant ports beyond Sacramento without excessive cost.

Gentlemen, I thank you for this opportunity of appearing before you and I urge your favorable consideration of an appropriation for this project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Stone, and thank you all of you gentlemen.

Mr. Moss. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will send you the material you requested relative to new cargo and the possible effect on other ports.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Moss.

Mr. EVINS. There are several prepared statements which we will insert in the record at this point.

(The statements are as follows:)

SACRAMENTO SHIP CHANNEL—STATEMENT BY HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, WESTERN SECTION, MAY 3, 1955

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, by name is Hubert B. Scudder and I represent the First Congressional District of California. I appear before you today in the hope that some additional moneys may be made aavilable for the continuation of the Sacramento River ship channel. This project is one of the important developments in central California. Its completion will create a deepwater harbor 90 miles from San Francisco on the Sacramento River, serving the city of Sacramento and many thousands of square miles of inland territory.

The Sacramento is a natural center for the shipment of agricultural and industrial products from that area.

The importance of the Sacramento ship channel to the people of central California is emphasized by the support already obtained on a State and local basis. Extensive plans have been made for the development of a well-rounded port facility.

It was contemplated and, I believe, agreed that there would be both Federal and local participation in the cost of this project. In the past few years little or no Federal funds have been appropriated for carrying on this project. I trust that this committee, in apportioning money for various projects, will see fit to include some moneys for the reviving of work on this project.

STATEMENT OF W. G. STONE, PORT DIRECTOR AND GENERAL MANAGER, SACRAMENTO-YOLO PORT DISTRICT

THE SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL

An appropriation of $2 million by Congress this year will allow the Army Corps of Engineers to resume work on the deepwater ship channel from the Golden Gate at San Francisco to California's State capital at Sacramento.

Since the project was authorized by Congress, the Sacramento-Yolo Port District and the State of California have spent or committed more than $3,100,000 required as the local contribution to the development. Local public agencies have spent an additional $600,000 on the promise that the project would be completed after Congress authorized it and spent $2,566,000 in Federal funds to get it started. Private groups have spent an additional $2,850,000 on the development.

THE PROJECT

Four miles of channel have been dug and the project, first authorized by Congress in 1946, is about 8 percent completed. The Sacramento-Yolo Port District was formed, bonds were floated, taxes were collected, the State of California put up $750,000 to buy land, and Congress appropriated $275,000 in 1948 to start work.

The Army Corps of Engineers, with the agreement of the Budget Bureau, now is using $67,000 previously loaned by the port district to finish plans for the channel. Work can be started as soon as Congress appropriates funds.

The project is shown on the picture and Army Corps of Engineers drawing on the following two pages. The picture shows the route ships will follow from the ocean, through the Golden Gate and a series of bays, to the navigable part of the Sacramento River. From there oceangoing ships will sail the channel to Lake Washington Harbor at the edge of Sacramento. At the harbor a barge canal will connect the deepwater channel with the Sacramento River, permitting smaller ships and barges to funnel into the port from the north.

The Army engineers map shows the route the channel will follow, using some of the waterways cutting through the Sacramento River Delta.

THE NEED FOR THE CHANNEL

In their second review of the benefits of the project, completed in January 1954, the Army Corps of Engineers decided the project would be beneficial from an economic standpoint and could be built easily from an engineering standpoint.

The area which will be served by the port is shown on the following page. It covers more than 1 million square miles in southern Oregon, most of Nevada, and northern California.

This service area is, in effect, a market for products from the East and Midwest. Manufactured products, processed foods, and thousands of other items can be sent into the area cheaper through the Sacramento-Yolo port. Lower transportation costs mean a lower selling price, resulting in a higher volume of sales for the items produced in the other parts of the Nation for the consumers in southern Oregon, Nevada, and northern California.

The Army engineers, in their recent survey of the benefits of the project, estimated an annual average traffic of 741,000 tons of manufactured goods and produce during the next 50 years through the port in oceangoing vessels and an additional 3,300,000 tons using the shallow draft barge canal to reach direct markets farther north.

THE VALUE OF THE CHANNEL

Last January both houses of the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Joint Resolution No. 11 asking Congress to live up to the bargain made when the Sacramento River deepwater channel was authorized and funds were appropriated for initial construction. Completion of the project was delayed by the Korean war, but it is too important for further delay.

Canned food, rice, barley, other grains, and many other products from the port's trading area can be shipped to consumers in the East and other parts of the Nation much more cheaply through the Sacramento-Yolo port. In their January 1954 study the Army Corps of Engineers used the example of a $2.31 saving per ton of rice shipped through the Sacramento-Yolo port compared to present shipping methods.

The picture on the following page, showing the port area as it will appear after completion, indicates the commercial area which will funnel its products through the port.

In addition, there are flood- and salinity-control benefits, and there is a national-defense value. Three major military installations will receive their supplies and ship out their products through the Sacramento-Yolo port. The facility will be invaluable as a staging area in the event of military action closing California's seacoast ports.

The people of California have done their share, and more, to make the Sacramento-Yolo port a reality. The Congress should appropriate funds to resume work on this project of importance to California and to the Nation.

STATEMENT OF W. G. STONE, PORT DIRECTOR, SACRAMENTO-YOLO PORT DISTRICT, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

The Sacramento River deepwater channel project was authorized in 1946 by Public Law 525, construction started by the Federal Government in 1949, but due to the Korean outbreak in June 1950, the construction program was slowed down and eventually construction was stopped after completing about 4 miles of the deepwater channel in the Cache Slough area.

The Sacramento-Yolo Port District, created for the specific purpose of developing the project, gave assurance to the Federal Government it would meet the requirements of the act of authorization (see appendix I), then bonded and taxed the port district to carry out the provisions of that agreement. Up to the present time the port district has collected $1,082,572 in taxes since it was created in 1947 in order to amortize outstanding bonds, purchase rights-of-way requested by the Federal Government, and carry out port district plans and operations, all in compliance with above agreement of assurance.

The 4-year delay, 1951 to 1955, in completing the dredging of the channel by the Federal Government is placing an additional heavy financial burden on our local people and is costing vast sums of money in both amortization and operating costs without receiving corresponding economic benefits from the project as intended.

The Federal Government started the project in accordance with the 1946 authorization. Local interests immediately met their prescribed obligations and have even gone much further along those lines than required. For example, the port district loaned $500,000 of its bond money to speed up the start of the construction program.

Let's take a look at the investment made by local interests and also by the Federal Government since the project was authorized in 1946 and actual construction started in August 1949. The following statement tells a most interesting story:

Expenditure required of and met by local interests:	
Port taxes collected for bonds, port design, right-of-way and operations	$1,082,572
Capital accounts of port (includes $656,000 State right-of-way money)	1,944,258
Total	3,026,830
Right-of-way under negotiation	94,000
Total required	3,120,830

Expenditures made by local interests due to start of project although not specifically required by local interests:	
State of California: Harbor Boulevard overpass	$288,000
Ryer Island ramp	20,000
Port money loaned to Federal Government	200,000
Excavation, channel and barge canal	100,000
Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative	2,250,000
Haslett Port warehouse	300,000
Haslett Port warehouse	300,000
Total	3,458,000
Total made on account of start of port but not required in authorization act	3,458,000
Total local investment made or committed to Apr. 1, 1955	6,578,830
Total Federal investment to June 30, 1954	2,566,308

For example: Expenditures required of local interests and which have already been made, $3,026,830; rights-of-way under negotiation at the present time, total $94,000, making a total local investment already made and committed of $3,120,830. Looking at the right-hand column, we find local public and private interests have met and now have under construction a total of $3,458,000 improvements and developments made wholly as a result of start of construction of the deepwater channel project by the United States but which were not actually required of those local interests under the act of authorization. When we add this total of $3,458,000 not required to the required investment of $3,120,830, we obtain a total investment made and committed up to April 1, 1955, of $6,578,830.

The Federal Government investment in planning and construction of the deepwater channel project up to June 30, 1954, is $2,566,308. You will note, therefore, the local investment is 2½ times that of the Federal Government.

The Sacramento district engineer had no available funds to provide necessary rights-of-way specifications. This has delayed purchase of many easements and rights-of-way. To overcome this handicap, our port district commission in 1954 authorized the use of $67,000 unexpended port district funds for this purpose—same having been previously loaned to the Federal Government. I am pleased to report that the Sacramento district engineer has made excellent use of those funds and has just furnished us a list of virtually all necessary rights-of-way and pursuant thereto, agreements are being worked out with most of the landowners for such easements and rights-of-way. We will leave nothing undone, however, to have all the particular easements and rights-of-way in the hands of the district engineer in ample time to proceed with his construction timetable immediately after July 1, 1955. In fact, the port district has owned almost 1,000 acres of these lands for the past 6 years.

One phase of local participation in the project is the relocation of a portion of California State Highway 99 across the barge canal bridge. Farmland and a large number of city lots were purchased by the port district in 1949–50 for rights-of-way for this relocation. An agreement was executed February 20, 1950, between the port district and the California Department of Public Works, Division of Highways, but this agreement carried an expiration date of February 20, 1955, unless the Federal Government had constructed the barge canal and its bridge. It became necessary, therefore, to take it up with the California Department of Public Works, Division of Highways, and secure a 5-year extension of this agreement due to failure of the Federal Government to proceed with construction as contemplated when rights-of-way were purchased for this highway relocation in 1949. The agreement was finally extended for an additional 5 years to February 20, 1960.

The Sacramento district engineer has made excellent long-range plans in designing the deepwater channel project itself and these plans mean that the project will not have to be changed 5 or 6 times in the near future. It is a project which will serve a long-range navigation program. Our port district terminal plans have been worked out on the same long-range basis.

I call your attention to appendix 2 which shows the nature and scope of these plans. The shaded area comprises 971 acres on which the port district has owned the fee title since 1949. Six years have passed and no work done on it except to build the levees in 1949. Why delay the construction? As a matter of fact, our port district plans and those of the Sacramento district engineer

have advanced to the point where he (the district engineer) can advertise for bids immediately after July 1, 1955, if funds are made available to him.

A definite need exists for an additional inland port in northern California for the reason that existing northern California ports cannot economically handle Sacramento and Sacramento area traffic. Frankly, it costs vast sums of money exceeding $1,500,000 annually for this Sacramento area traffic originating in more than 20 counties north and east of Sacramento to reach those more distant northern California ports. The existing deepwater port facilities are simply not in the right place to handle the ever-increasing volume of traffic produced in the Sacramento tributary area. It also costs more to load ships at most of those more distant ports. It is a well-known fact that ships follow cargo throughout the world. It is also a fact that new inland ports, with the latest cargo handling devices permit speedier loading and discharging of cargo and therefor effect a substantial saving to steamship companies when their vessels are sent to such inland ports. In other words, speedy cargo handling and a quick turnaround of the vessel cut ship operating costs.

The following brief statement of facts will, I think, be helpful. The Sacramento River deepwater channel project was authorized by Public Law 525 on July 24, 1946. The plans call for a channel 30 feet deep and 200 feet bottom width. It is 15 miles shorter than the present crooked river route, accomplished by using connecting sloughs and waterways and by so doing is practically straight, without sharp bends in the channel. The deepwater channel terminates in Lake Washington with a large turning basin for maneuvering of vessels in the harbor. A shallow draft barge canal 13 feet deep and 86 feet wide through the shallow draft lock will connect the deepwater turning basin with the Sacramento River, a distance of 1¼ miles. This lock keeps floodwaters and river currents out of the deepwater channel for the last 25 miles.

Appendix 4 is the district engineer's drawing of the project indicating a 4-mile section completed in 1951, completed portion being shown in red and with the turning basin and harbor lines at Lake Washington also shown in red. The heavy black line shows the route of the channel via the last 25 miles. When a ship enters this channel, it will be comparable to navigating a smooth lake for the last 25 miles to the deepwater turning basin. We have had a model of the Sacramento River deepwater channel made to scale showing the route of the channel from the turning basin in Lake Washington to the sea at San Francisco. This model has been photographed and a print of this photograph supplied to you shows that the turning basin at the head of the deep-sea channel has a short, shallow draft barge canal connecting with the river. A lock in the barge canal shown in the inset in the upper left-hand corner of the photograph, keeps Sacramento River water from entering the turning basin and the deepwater channel except as shallow draft vessels pass through the lock. Incidentally, the river is navigable upstream for more than 100 miles. This permits the river to serve as a feeder to the deepwater vessels in the harbor.

The channel itself is almost straight for 25 miles downstream. This is accomplished by using drainage canals and sloughs connected with the Sacramento River. There will be no river currents or flood waters entering this channel to interfere with navigation. Four miles of the channel were completed by the Federal Government in 1951 at a point just above the only bridge across the channel which is at Rio Vista. This model was constructed to scale, consequently, the photograph reflects a correct picture of this deepwater channel development which will bring deep-sea ships 90 miles inland to serve a rapidly developing and tonnage producing area.

The Sacramento-Yolo port district was created April 15, 1947 for the specific purpose of developing the deepwater channel and port terminal facilities and to provide the necessary corporate entity to represent local interests in dealing with the Federal Government, the State of California and others.

The State of California by legislative action July 7, 1947 indicated statewide interest in the project by approving and making an appropriation of $750,000 to the port district for rights of way, contingent upon the Federal Government making an appropriation for construction and the further requirement that the port district vote additional bonds for local participation.

The port district made long-range plans for port development and on November 4, 1947 voted $3,750,000 to finance local participation, then immediately constructed belt railroad facilities, highways, a grain elevator, a grain warehouse and other improvements.

The agreement of assurance to the Federal Government (appendix 1) was accepted by the Secretary of Army February 3, 1948 (appendix 3).

In 1948 Congress made its first construction appropriation of $275,000, thereby releasing the State of California appropriation of $750,000 for rights of way.

In May 1949 the port district purchased its first property for rights of way and following thereafter, additional necessary rights of way for the upper 2 miles of the deepwater channel, the harbor, barge canal and in addition, areas for future warehouses, wharves, transit sheds and other port development facilities. A total of 971 acres was purchased in 1949 (appendix 2).

The Federal Government broke ground and started construction on August 7, 1949 and at that time the completion date was scheduled for July 1953.

Based upon that prompt and splendid start in construction by the Federal Government, the port district on September 19, 1949 contracted to build a 500,000-bushel-capacity grain elevator and on the same day leased it to the Kerr-Gifford & Co., Inc., of California, an experienced grain merchant. Belt railroad facilities and highways were constructed and this elevator began its operation July 1, 1950. Both the port district and the lessee of this elevator anticipated and, in fact, very definitely expected and depended upon water transportation being made available to the elevator in about 3 years time. This has not been accomplished. The elevator can only be used by rail and highway. We direct your attention to appendix 5, a photograph of this elevator. You will note the large black arrow pointing to a large square on the head house of this elevator. This square was designed for a direct shipside conveyor to the waterfront for handling of grain, both by deep-sea vessels and by shallow-draft vessels. For 5 long years this elevator has been used only by rail and highway. When, yes, when—may we ask—will it be possible for us to open this door and make this elevator used as it was intended, namely for the interchange of traffic between deep-sea and shallow-draft vessels on one hand and rail and highway carriers on the other?

The present 10 foot channel in the Sacramento River is no longer adequate to meet the needs of commerce. Intercoastal steamship companies canceled intercoastal terminal rates to the Atlantic coast by transshipment on October 1, 1952. This immediately took about 210,000 tons of general cargo off the Sacramento River during the year 1952. Since that time, general cargo on the Sacramento River has dropped each year. While it is true that almost 2 million tons of cargo move on the river by barge and shallow draft vessels, it is predominantly petroleum products with a limited amount of grain, rice and a dwindling general cargo. See appendix 6 which shows the trend of movement and a declining general cargo.

The present status of the deepwater channel project is that 4 miles of the channel in the Cache Slough area just north of Rio Vista have been completed to project width and depth. This is clearly shown in appendix 4. Levees and harbor lines have been established in the upper 2 miles of channel, around the harbor area and along the barge canal.

We direct your attention to appendix 7. This is an air view taken on April 1, 1955. The Lake Washington turning basin area is shown in the lower right hand of the photograph. The port district grain elevator with its connecting rail and highway facilities in the center. In the upper center is shown the rice elevator and dryer of the Farmers Rice Growers Cooperative, constructed in 1954. The 5-story rice mill contiguous to the elevator is presently under construction. Immediately beyond this plant is the new warehouse of the Haslett Warehouse Co. completed and placed in operation September 20, 1954. This is private capital invested in industrial and terminal facilities near the deepwater turning basin, depending upon completion of the deepwater channel project for successful economic operation. The district engineer has completed plans for the lock in the barge canal and the combination railroad and highway bridge across the canal and these plans are now ready to advertise for bids without delay. The port district purchased rights of way for this barge canal in May 1949. Plans have also been drawn by the district engineer for dredging of drainage canals and waterways in the vicinity of Liberty Island and Prospect Slough areas. I have indicated the location of those canals in blue on appendix 4. We will have these rights of way when the district engineer needs them. Bids for all of this construction work could be advertised and dredging completed promptly after a Federal appropriation is made for the purpose.

Local interests have fully met all requirements placed upon them by the Act of Authorization and have even gone much farther. For example; the State of California has expended $288,000 for the Harbor Boulevard overpass, providing direct highway access to the port terminal area without passing through any congested residential or business areas.

Appendix 8 and 9 are two photographs showing the nature and scope of this Harbor Boulevard overpass construction. The port district elevator and the Farmers Rice Growers elevator are also shown in the background of the semi-cloverleaf in Appendix 9. This structure was placed in operation in June 1954.

In addition, the division of highways expended $20,000 on a new Ryer Island ferry approach in 1951. None of this work, either on the Harbor Boulevard overpass or on the Ryer Island ferry would have been done or was it even necessary, except for the deepwater channel project. It was done in reliance on the Federal Government completing its part of the deepwater channel construction program.

Local interests have also gone a step further and have excavated by land equipment 503,948 yards of material out of the upper 2 miles of the deepwater channel and out of the barge canal. Appendix 10 shows the upper 2 miles of the deepwater channel area from which this material was excavated down to the waterline. Computing this excavation at a cost of 20 cents per yard, this in reality is equivalent to a local interest cash contribution exceeding $100,000. In other words, the Federal Government will not be required to excavate this 503,948 yards by hydraulic dredger.

The California State Legislature by joint resolution, unanimously passed on January 21, 1955, memoralized the President and Congress of the United States and the Corps of Engineers that immediate steps be taken to resume construction of the project. Appendix 11 is an exact copy of this resolution.

Let me repeat—that delay in completion of this project is placing a very heavy burden financially on the port district and local interests in amortizing port district bonds and in operating existing port property without obtaining the corresponding benefits from them. More than $1 million has been collected in port district taxes for this purpose, plus $750,000 State of California tax money for rights-of-way.

The port district grain elevator was definitely designed for water transportation. It is handicapped in full utilization since it can only be used by railroad and motortruck.

Private industry has also made a heavy investment in industrial and warehouse facilities, depending upon deep-sea transportation being made available by the Federal Government. Typical is the plant of the Farmers Rice Growers Cooperative where $2,250,000 private money is being invested in the rice elevator, dryer, the rice mill and warehouse presently under construction, shown in appendix 7. This investment is being made on the premise the Federal Government will quickly complete the project.

The Haslett Sacramento-Yolo port warehouse has been constructed by private capital at a cost exceeding $300,000, contiguous to the port and placed it in operation September 20, 1954. Appendixes 12 and 13 show 2 exterior views of this warehouse and cargo available for water transportation stored in the warehouse is shown in appendixes 14 and 15. Notwithstanding this preparation to make this cargo available for water transportation, it can use only rail and highway until the deepwater channel is completed.

Appendix 16 shows two immense Erickson warehouses in North Sacramento, 150 feet in width by 600 feet in length, each providing 90,000 square feet of warehouse space. One of these warehouses is used wholly for storage of canned fruits and vegetables, a substantial portion of which would move by water to worldwide markets. The other warehouse is presently used for Government long-term storage of grain.

Appendix 17 is a typical cannery warehouse scene at Sacramento where canned fruits and vegetables are shown in storage after canning, preparatory to shipment to worldwide markets.

Appendix 18 is a new rice hull byproducts plant constructed in West Sacramento in 1954 at a cost exceeding $300,000.

Appendix 19 shows the concentration of major military installations within a 50-mile radius of the deepwater turning basin in Lake Washington. These military establishments can make substantial economic use of the deepwater channel project, making the project contribute to the efficiency and economy of our national defense program.

It is most essential that a minimum of $2 million be appropriated for fiscal year 1955–56 in order that the Sacramento district engineer can advertise for bids and make construction contracts to cover the work which he can actually have accomplished between July 1, 1955, and July 1, 1956. It is false economy to further delay construction of the project.

In view of the foregoing facts we earnestly request favorable consideration of this honorable committee to our request for this $2 million appropriation for fiscal year 1955–56.

I thank the committee for the privilege of making this presentation.

DEEPWATER CHANNEL, SACRAMENTO RIVER, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—AGREEMENT OF ASSURANCE TO THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by Public Law 525, 79th Congress, 2d session, approved on July 24, 1946, did authorize the construction of that certain deepwater channel on the Sacramento River, near Sacramento, in the State of California, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 142, 79th Congress, 2d session, and did also require that local interests furnish asurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will (*a*) furnish without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas for the initial work and subsequent maintenance when and as required and to make all necessary utility changes; (b) construct, operate, and maintain at the Washington Lake Basin an adequate public terminal as approved by the Chief of Engineers with necessary utilities and rail and highway connections open to all on equal terms; and (*c*) hold and save the United States free from any damages which may arise from construction, operation, and maintenance of the improvements; and

Whereas the qualified electors of the Counties of Sacramento and Yolo, State of California, at a special election, duly authorized and called according to law, and held on the 15th day of April 1947, did create and establish the Sacramento-Yolo Port District in the State of California; and

Whereas the Legislative Assembly of the State of California, of 1947, did by senate bill No. 730, now known as chapter 1152, 1947 Statutes of the State of California, which was approved July 7, 1947, authorize and empower the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, Sacramento, Calif., to give such assurance to the Secretary of the Army:

Now, therefore, the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, Sacramento, Calif., July created and authorized by law does hereby give assurance to the Secretary of the Army that it will (*a*) furnish without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas for the initial work and subsequent maintenance when and as required and to make all necessary utility changes; (*b*) construct, operate, and maintain at the Washington Lake Basin an adequate public terminal, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, with necessary utilities and rail and highway connections open to all on equal terms; and (*c*) hold and save the United States free from any damages which may arise from construction, operation, and maintenance of the improvement.

In witness whereof, the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, Sacramento, Calif., in meeting assembled, has caused this instrument to be executed this 24th day of December 1947, at Sacramento, Calif.

SACRAMENTO-YOLO PORT DISTRICT,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
by W. G. STONE, *Port Director.*
by IVORY J. RODDA, *Secretary.*

WAR DEPARTMENT,
CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER, SACRAMENTO DISTRICT,
Sacramento, Calif., February 20, 1948.

Refer to file No. PSKKA 800.06 (Sacramento River deepwater channel)

SACRAMENTO-YOLO PORT DISTRICT,
Sacramento 14, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: This office has received information that the agreement of assurance submitted by your office covering local participation in the Sacramento River deepwater channel project was approved by the Secretary of the Army under date of February 3, 1948.

It is anticipated that further information regarding rights-of-way to be furnished by your office will be forwarded within the next few months.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) E. A. BRULE,
Chief Administrative Assistant
(For the district engineer).

Sacramento River tonnage

Year	Petroleum	General cargo	Total
1941	353,440	456,029	809,469
1942	586,322	307,313	893,635
1943	609,461	223,195	832,656
1944	627,522	221,781	849,303
1945	701,773	254,716	956,489
1946	792,046	285,617	1,077,663
1947	864,030	516,172	1,380,202
1948	1,063,821	477,687	1,541,508
1949	1,065,313	544,770	1,610,083
1950	1,077,289	513,594	1,590,883
1951	1,290,819	684,404	1,975,223
1952	1,415,786	[1] 473,680	1,889,466
1953	1,544,271	427,788	1,972,059

[1] Intercoastal terminal rates canceled Oct. 1, 1952, leaving only 9 months general cargo movement.

Source: United States Engineers annual reports.

SACRAMENTO RIVER SHIP CHANNEL PROJECT STATEMENT OF MR. WESTON B. GRIMES

My name is Mr. Weston B. Grimes. I am a lawyer with offices in Washington, D. C., representing Cargill, Inc., of California, grain merchants and exporters. On September 19, 1949, the Kerr Gifford & Co., Inc. to the interests of which Cargill, Ins., has succeeded, entered into a lease with the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, Sacramento, Calif., leasing for a period of 30 years a 500,000 bushel capacity grain elevator to be constructed by the Sacramento-Yolo Port District. This plant was constructed on schedule and is now operated by Cargill, Inc.

About 6 weeks prior to that date, the Federal Government had broken ground and started construction of a Sacramento deep water channel project with the completion date scheduled for early 1953. The plans for this project provide a shallow draft barge canal 1¼ miles in length connected to the Sacramento River so that it may be utilized for barge transportation of grain for more than 100 miles upstream to the grain elevator at West Sacramento. Plans also called for an overhead conveyor from the grain elevator to deep sea and shallow draft shipping in the deep water turning basin.

Cargill, Inc., is handicapped by the delay in completion of both the deepwater channel project and the connecting shallow-draft barge canal. When this elevator was leased, it was expected that the Federal Government would complete the project program within approximately 4 years but this has not been done. We realize the Korean war is largely responsible for the delay but we feel that the time has now arrived when construction should be resumed and this project completed without delay. Incidentally, the major market for California grain in the foreseeable future appears to be in the Orient and Eastern Asia where more people are starving than elsewhere throughout the world. It is increasingly necessary, therefore, that this deepwater channel project be completed quickly in order that we may have the benefit of deep-sea transportation for grain export.

We urge your committee, therefore, to give favorable consideration to the request for appropriation of funds for resumption of construction.

I thank you for this opportunity of appearing before the committee in this respect.

CHAPTER 57

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 11—Relative to the Sacramento River Ship Channel

Whereas the Sacramento River Ship Channel project was authorized by Congress in 1946 in Public Law 525, Seventy-ninth Congress, Second Session, and construction started in 1949 with the completion date scheduled for July 1953; and

Whereas the California State Legislature by Chapter 1152, 1947 Statutes, approved and adopted the project for navigation and flood control on the Sacramento River in cooperation with the Federal Government in accordance with

Senate Document 142, Seventy-ninth Congress, Second Session; declared the state interest therein; provided certain powers and duties of the Sacramento-Yolo Port District and the Department of Finance in connection therewith; provided for the acquisition of certain property rights therefor; and made an appropriation; and

Whereas the State of California has a total investment of approximately one million dollars ($1,000,000) in the project at the present time, including as a phase of the West Sacramento Freeway the Harbor Boulevard overpass to the port terminal area; and

Whereas the Sacramento-Yolo Port District voted three million seven hundred fifty thousand dollars ($3,750,000) in bonds for local participation, and has sold one million seven hundred fifty thousand dollars ($1,750,000), and is presently burdened with amortization of those bonds; and

Whereas the port district has constructed a grain elevator, belt railroad, and highways, with the grain elevator leased to private grain merchants who are depending upon completion of the deep water channel for successful operation of the grain elevator; and

Whereas private local businessmen and farmers, depending upon early completion of the project, have invested two million five hundred thousand dollars ($2,500,000) in private warehouses, elevators, and other works adjacent to the port area; and

Whereas the Federal Government required the Sacramento-Yolo Port District to give assurance that local interests would meet requirements in the act of authorization, and the port district has met each and every one of those requirements; and

Whereas construction was stopped at the outbreak of the Korean War, after completion of four miles of channel north of Rio Vista at a cost of two million five hundred forty-eight thousand dollars ($2,548,000) to the Federal Government; and

Whereas the deep water channel when completed will serve more than 20 counties in the northeastern part of California north and east of Sacramento; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States, and the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, to take such steps as may be necessary to resume construction on the project immediately, and to make an appropriation sufficient to defray the cost of such work as can be accomplished by the Corps of Engineers during the 1955–56 Fiscal Year; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the House and Senate Appropriation Committees for Civil Functions, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Army.

STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY V. A. DILLON, SPECIAL COUNSEL, SACRAMENTO YOLO PORT DISTRICT

I am appearing before this committee in support of an appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 for resumption of construction work on the Sacramento River deepwater channel project.

The Sacramento River deepwater channel project had its inception in a report of the district engineer, United States Army, Sacramento, Calif., to the Chief of Engineers dated June 1, 1945. It was made in response to the following resolution of October 26, 1933:

"*Resolved by the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate,* That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, be, and is hereby, requested to review the reports on the Sacramento River contained in House Document No. 123, 69th Congress, 1st session, with a view to determining whether any modification in the existing project is advisable at the present time."

The report, which was based on an exhaustive study over many years and public hearings concluded with a recommendation that the existing navigation project on the Sacramento River be modified to provide for the construction, of a ship channel 30 feet deep and from 200 to 300 feet wide from deepwater in

Suisun Bay to and including a harbor and turning basin at Lake Washington; and a connecting barge canal and lock between the proposed harbor at Lake Washington and the Sacramento River at Sacramento.

The report of the District Engineer was reviewed by the War Department's Board of Enginers for Rivers and Harbors, Washington, D. C., and was the subject of public hearings before that body. In its report dated October 15, 1945, the Board stated, among other things, the following:

"* * * The section of the great Central Valley of California and adjacent areas which would be served by the proposed deep-draft channel is rich in natural resources. Its productivity and suitability for industrial development will be enhanced by recently constructed and authorized improvement for flood control, irrigation, hydroelectric development, and other purposes. Taking the potentialities of the area into account as well as its current activities, the Board is of the opinion that provision of the deep-draft channel will return benefits substantially in excess of its costs.

"Accordingly, the Board recommends modificaiton of the existing navigation project for Sacramento River, Calif., to provide for construction of a ship channel * * *; in general accordance with the plans of the district engineer as shown on the accompanying drawing * * *."

Under the date of February 8, 1946, the Chief of Engineers transmitted the favorable report of the Board of Engineers for River and Harbors to the Senate Committee on Commerce.

In April of the same year the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors held 3 days of public hearings on the project. The corresponding Senate committee also held similar hearings shortly thereafter. Both committees reported favorably on the project and provided for its authorization in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946, which became Public Law 525, 79th Congress, 2d session.

Congress made an appropriation of $250,000 to start construction in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1949, supplemented by $25,000 for design work from other funds. It followed this with a second appropriation of $1,700,000 for the fiscal year 1950. The President's budget for the fiscal year 1951 contained a recommendation of $2,500,000 for the project, against which the House allowed $1,500,000 and the Senate $2,500,000. While the bill was in conference the Korean conflict broke out. The President, in a message to Congress dated July 19, 1950, and in a directive 2 days later to the Secretary of the Army, ordered a slowing down or curtailment of civil-works projects "not directly contributing to defense or to civilian requirements essential in the changed international situation." The conferees pared the Senate bill by $76 million and directed the Corps of Engineers to reduce it by an additional $50 million, making new allocations in accordance with the President's directive.

The corps reduced funds for the Sacramento River deep-water-channel project to $263,000 for the fiscal year 1951, the amount needed to complete an existing contract. The Sacramento district engineer reports the total expenditures for planning and construction up to June 30, 1954, amounted to $2,566,308. The last Federal appropriation for construction was for fiscal year 1951.

Work done prior to the shutdown consisted of widening, deepening, and straightening Cache Slough to project width and depth just above Rio Vista for about 4 miles. This work together with the establishment of levees and partial dredging in the harbor and barge-canal areas makes the project about 8 percent complete at the present time. Preliminary engineering work has been completed, leaving only completion of final plans and the physical job of removing some 71 million cubic yards of spoil in the channel, harbor, barge canal, and drainage canals remaining. The engineers estimate that this work could be accomplished in 4 years from the time funds first become available. Thus, if funds are provided for the fiscal year 1956 the project could be a reality in 1960.

The authorization of the Sacramento River deep-water-channel project required that responsible local interests give satisfactory assurance to the Secretary of the Army that they will—

(1) Furnish without cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas for the initial work and subsequent maintenance when and as required and make all necessary utility changes necessary for the construction of the project;

(2) Construct, operate, and maintain at the Washington Lake Basin an adequate public terminal with necessary utilities and rail and highway connections open to all on equal terms; and

(3) Hold and save the United States free from any damages which may arise from construction, operation, and maintenance of the improvement.

Immediately upon arrival of the act of July 24, 1946, the local interests undertook to comply with the requirements of local cooperation. Within 8 months, on April 15, 1947, they formed the Sacramento-Yolo Port District under the laws of the State of California. Then followed in quick succession an appropriation of $750,000 to the port district by the State Legislature of California for the purpose of acquiring rights-of-way, easements, etc.; approval of a $3,750,000-bond issue by the port district by an overwhelming vote; the approval by the Secretary of the Army of agreement of assurance, executed on behalf of the port district, guaranteeing the fulfillment of the conditions of local cooperation.

The port district proceeded with great haste to live up to its agreement with the Federal Government. By December 1949 it had acquired 971 acres by fee title, plus spoil-disposal rights on an additional 380 acres of farmland. With court approval, the port district on August 2, 1948, loaned $500,000 to the Federal Government to initiate and speed up construction. As of last June 30, the capital accounts of the port district were as follows:

1. Buildings, railways, pavement, channels, etc.:	
Grain elevator, 500,000-bushel capacity leased for 30 years to Kerr Gifford & Co., Inc., of California	$802,759.60
Grain elevator office building	20,465.43
Future grain elevator expansion	4,000.00
Belt railroad, 4 miles of belt railroad connecting with both the Southern Pacific and Western Pacific systems	204,507.82
Domestic water line	6,192.56
Fire-protection system	25,966.74
Highway pavement, over 1 mile of paved highway on port property	58,690.25
Field office	1,863.76
Channels	123,615.38
Total	1,248,061.54
2. Property acquisition, total	696,196.47
Total capital accounts, fixed assets, June 30, 1954	1,944,258.02

A review of the port district's receipts and expenditures from July 1, 1947, to April 15, 1955, shows the following:

Receipts:	
1. Taxes collected	$1,082,572
2. State of California for acquisition of rights-of-way	655,770
3. Rental, investment and farm income	219,088
Total receipts	1,957,430
Expenditures:	
1. Cost of servicing bond issues:	
(a) Interest to Apr. 15, 1955	215,813
(b) Payments on principal	300,000
Servicing costs	515,813
2. Expended from port construction fund	1,596,054
3. Maintenance and operation expenses	294,808
Total expenditures	2,406,675

Not only has the port district made heavy investments in and of the project, but the State of California and private interests have likewise done their part.

It has already been recorded that the State legislature in July 1947, appropriated $750,000 to the port district for use in the acquisition of property. Last year the State division of highways completed the $288,000 Harbor Boulevard overpass to the West Sacramento Freeway giving direct truck and other vehicular access from the freeway to the harbor area. In addition, the Ryer Island Ferry approach cost the State of California $20,000.

Local private interests have also made substantial investments in reliance on early completion of the project. The Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative is spending $2,250,000 in constructing a rice dryer, elevator, mill, and warehouse at the harbor, $300,000 was expended in 1954 in the construction of the Haslett

Port warehouse, and an additional $300,000 is now being spent on another warehouse, also located at the harbor.

In view of these facts, it cannot be denied that the local people (State, port, and private) have extended themselves in keeping their part of the bargain made with the Federal Government more than 7 years ago.

In spite of the inaction of the Federal Government the local people have not lost heart. At their instance the district engineer was authorized to expend $67,000 (the unexpended balance of $200,000 still owed the port district from a loan of $500,000 made to the Federal Government in 1949) to complete design and provide needed rights-of-way specifications. These funds were expended during the current fiscal year with result the port district has been able to continue with the acquisition of the necessary rights-of-way and easements. If funds are appropriated this year, construction can be resumed shortly after next July 1

The State of California has likewise had confidence that the Federal Government will keep faith with the local people. Only last year its Division of Highways completed the Harbor Boulevard overpass to the port terminal area.

In January 1955, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 11 passed the California State Assembly and Senate without a dissenting vote. This resolution urges the Federal Government to take whatever steps are necessary to resume construction of the project in the fiscal year 1956. Likewise, Gov. Goodwin J. Knight has repeatedly urged the Congress and the executive agencies to resume work on the project.

Virtually every civic and business organization in the northern California tributary area of the project has urged its prompt completion in resolutions and letters addressed to the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget and the Corps of Engineer. Following is a list of endorsements by some 30 such organizations:

Gov. Goodwin J. Knight of California
Northern California County Supervisors Association
Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
Yolo County Board of Supervisors
Sacramento City Council
Sacramento Chamber of Commerce
Association of Chambers of Commerce of Yolo County
California Junior Chamber of Commerce, district II
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
Hale Bros. Department Store
Rice Growers Association of California
Continental Nut Co.
The Diamond Match Co.
Emil G. Schaffnit
Calaveras Cement Co.
Tehama County Board of Supervisors
El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
Marysville City Council
Slater Electric Co.
Orland Chamber of Commerce
Yuba City, city council
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce
Folsom Chamber of Commerce
Davis Chamber of Commerce
Orville Chamber of Commerce
Willows City Council
Marysville-Yuba County Chamber of Commerce
Colusa County Board of Supervisors
Central Labor Council, Stockton, Calif.
Sacramento Builders Exchange

Nor is the support for the project limited to the local people. The Corps of Engineers recently reviewed the project economics and under date of January 8, 1954, reported that it is a sound project. They carry it on their roster as an active project, and privately and publicly have maintained that it deserves resumption at the earliest possible moment.

CONCLUSION

Today there exists at Lake Washington in West Sacramento the start of a complete port facility, but depending upon an adequate harbor depth and access to the sea. In compliance with the terms of the legislation which authorized the Sacramento River deepwater channel project, a responsible political body, the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, has been established by the local people and has provided the physical components of a modern and efficient harbor—a belt railroad, highways, utilities, and a 500,000-bushel capacity grain elevator located and designed for deep-sea transportation of grain but presently accessible only by rail and highway. To build these facilities, the port district has had to tax the local people to the extent of over $1 million since 1947, and has had to sell and service some $1,750,000 in bonds. Two hundred local farmers are investing $2,250,000 of their own funds in the construction of a rice dryer, elevator, mill, and warehouse which were likewise designed and located for shipside loading of rice. Other private interests have constructed a port warehouse costing $300,000 and an additional $300,000 warehouse will be completed in 1955. The State of California has spent more than $1 million in aid of the project in appropriating $750,000 in 1947 for the acquisition of rights-of-way and in constructing an overpass from a nearby freeway to provide direct truck access to the harbor area at a cost of $288,000.

The detriment to the local people resulting from the Federal Government's failure to complete the project stems not only from the heavy tax burden the taxpayers of the district have borne, the cost of servicing a large bonded indebtedness, and the fact that the extensive capital improvements which were designed for shipside use are not being employed for that purpose, but from other factors as well. For one thing, the local program of attracting new industry is impaired because of the uncertainty as to when deepwater transportation will be available.

Inability of deep-sea ships to call at Sacramento costs shippers and receivers of freight throughout the United States an estimated $1½ million annually to reach shipside at other ports in northern California beyond Sacramento. On October 1, 1952, the intercoastal carriers canceled terminal rates from Sacramento to Atlantic ports. The immediate result of this was a reduction of almost one-fourth million tons of cargo on the river for the ensuing 3 months. This substantial reduction intonnage has continued ever since.

I understand that the Corps of Engineers have estimated that $2 million can advantageously be spent on the project in construction during the fiscal year of 1956. I, therefore, urgently recommend that this committee make an appropriation of that amount.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CLAIR ENGLE, SECOND DISTRICT, BEFORE WESTERN PANEL OF HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS

My name is Clair Engle. I represent the Second District of California.

I respectfully urge this committee to include funds for the resumption of construction work on the Sacramento River deepwater channel project in the bill it will report. As a Member of the 79th Congress, I supported the original authorization, noting the tremendous economic and population growth of the area since 1949. I feel that it is even more justified today.

Although the project is not located in my district, my people are deeply interested in it as it will open up with lower cost transportation the great inland industrial, farming, and national-resources empire of northern California.

My home is in Red Bluff, which is approximately 140 miles above Sacramento where this project is located. In the early 1900's, there was water transportation to Red Bluff. Although there is none that far up stream now, there is no reason why we cannot have it again. As a result of the raising of the mean level of the Sacramento River because of the construction of Shasta Dam, we can visualize the day with the Sacramento River deepwater channel project a reality when water transportation can be resumed to Red Bluff. When that day comes, the produce, manufactures, and resources of the people whom I represent will have water access to the ports of the world.

It is my candid belief that the Federal Government's failure to resume construction of this project is a gross breach of faith with the local people. It clearly points up a question of whether the United States obligation to a local governmental body, the Sacramento-Yolo Port District, and to the local people, is to be discharged without further delay in the interest of justice.

Those of us in the northern part of California, southern Oregon, and eastern Nevada, who vitally need this project, strongly urge immediate resumption of construction and urge that at least $2 million be granted for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to submit for the record the attached letters and resolutions from my constituents in support of appropriations for the project.

THE DIAMOND MATCH CO.,
Chico, Calif., October 25, 1954.

Subject: Port of Sacramento.

Mr. ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director, Bureau of the Budget
Executive Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: The Sacramento Valley is a large agricultural empire. It is well known for its large crops of rice, barley, wheat, fruit, nuts, and dairy products. Northern California also produces a tremendous amount of lumber and wood products from its forests.

The nearest port for exporting and importing the needs of this area is Stockton. The completion of port of Sacramento by deepening the channel from 18 feet to 30 feet will enable oceangoing freighters to come 50 miles closer to this great productive empire thereby saving 100 miles on the round trip beyond Sacramento. The producers and shippers of this area are entitled to the Sacramento port facilities for competitive and economic reasons. Shippers from Sacramento are entitled to terminal freight rates to be competitive with ports in Stockton, Oakland, San Francisco, and the bay area. Intercoastal carriers canceled terminal rates to and from Sacramento, since oceangoing vessels could not operate in the present 10-foot channel.

Undoubtedly large quantities of lumber, grain, and other agricultural products including honey, would be exported from port of Sacramento. Likewise, imports of lumber to Sacramento from Puget Sound, Portland, and the west coast of Oregon and northern California would save money for the consumers of this area.

While it was necessary to postpone completion of port of Sacramento during the Korean war, we hope that the 1954–55 budget will include the largest amount that can be expended for work actually done during that fiscal year.

I believe it unnecessary to review the records of accomplishments since 1946 as you are aware of what has been done to date. We do not want the importance of port of Sacramento overlooked, since it is desirable to have the project completed for oceangoing vessels serving this area at a date as early as possible.

Your favorable consideration and action will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

I. E. BRINK,
General Manager, Yards and Stores.

FEBRUARY 23, 1955.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inasmuch as California continues to grow and the outlook for continued growth is strong, all facilities of this State have to be expanded to meet and take care of this growth. Therefore, it would be to the benefit of many if the Sacramento deep water channel project were completed.

It is my understanding that the Federal budget does not include any money for the resumption of construction for this fiscal year, and I urge you to do all possible that funds be appropriated for this project.

Very truly yours,

CALAVERAS CEMENT CO.
MEL J. LONDON, *Vice President.*

RESOLUTION

Whereas Congress authorized the Sacramento deep water channel project in 1946 providing for a channel 30 feet deep at low tide and 200 feet bottom width and started construction in August 1949 with completion date set for the spring of 1953; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has spent over $2,660,000 on the project up to July 1, 1954, having completed approximately 4 miles up to project depth in the Cache Slough area, and established the channel levees on the upper 2 miles of the channel; also the harbor and barge canal levees; and

Whereas intercoastal steamship lines canceled terminal rates by transshipment from Sacramento to Atlantic coast ports on October 1, 1952, stating they could not send their vessels to Sacramento on the shallow 10-foot channel of the Sacramento River; and

Whereas this freight rate cancellation has worked a hardship upon shippers and receivers of freight in extra charges paid to reach shipside at more distant ports; and

Whereas the State of California approved the project in 1947 and appropriated $750,000 to the port district for rights-of-way and has spent $280,000 on a highway overpass providing main highway entrance to the port in connection with the West Sacramento freeway; and

Whereas due to the increasing growth of population in the Sacramento Valley and entire Pacific coast, it is necessary to the economic and social stability of the area, now even more so than at the time the Sacramento-Yolo port was originally authorized by Congress that every reasonable effort be made to encourage the development of business and industry in the area, both to provide for the basic needs of the large and growing population and to increase employment opportunities for those migrating to the west coast; and

Whereas the California State Legislature recognized this situation and passed Assembly Joint Resolution 11 adopted in the assembly January 20, 1955, and adopted in the Senate January 21, 1955, unanimously, memorializing the Federal Government to make such an appropriation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of Tehama County requests the Bureau of the Budget and the Chief of Engineers to include an adequate amount in the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1955–56 to cover the amount of work which the Chief of Engineers can accomplish during that fiscal year; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be supplied Senators Wm. F. Knowland and Thomas H. Kuchel, and Congressmen John E. Moss and Clair Engle, urging their support in making such an appropriation for the Sacramento River deep water channel project for the fiscal year 1955–56.

Passed and adopted by Board of Supervisors, County of Tehama, this 7th day of February 1955.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Congress authorized the Sacramento deep water channel project in 1946 providing for a channel 30 feet deep at low tide and 200-foot bottom width, and started construction in August 1949, with completion date set for the spring of 1953; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has spent over $2,500,000 on the project up to July 1954, having completed approximately 4 miles up to project depth in the Cache Slough area, and established the channel levees on the upper 2 miles of the channel; also the harbor and barge canal levees; and

Whereas intercoastal steamship lines canceled terminal rates by transshipment from Sacramento to Atlantic coast ports on October 1, 1952, stating they could not send their vessels to Sacramento on the shallow 10-foot channel of the Sacramento River; and

Whereas shippers and receivers of freight in these 24 northeastern California counties are subjected to higher costs of moving cargo to and from shipside as a result of this rate cancellation; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of California has adopted Assembly Joint Resolution 11 urging the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation sufficient to enable the Corps of Engineers to resume work on the Sacramento River deep water channel project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado finds that the public welfare requires early completion of the Sacramento River deep water channel project in order that ships may call at the port of Sacramento and load cargo from northern California counties and bring in manufactured products and general merchandise, thus restoring Pacific coast base rates between Sacramento and all ports of the Nation as well as to foreign ports; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Director, Bureau of the Budget and to the Chief of Engineers urging that an item be included in the 1955–56 budget for dredging, and this amount be as large as can be expended by the Corps of Engineers for work done during that fiscal year; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator William F. Knowland, Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, Congressman Clair Engle, and Congressman John E. Moss.

Passed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado, State of California, this 31st day of January 1955, by the following vote of the members of said board: Ayes: Supervisors John A. Winkelman, George H. Klare, Eugene A. Chappie, Cyril H. Heusner and R. G. Chism. Noes: None. Absent: None.

JOHNA. WINKELMAN,
Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of the County of El Dorado, State of California.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the tremendous increase in business and industry in the great Central Valley of California has increased to the point where a deepwater channel and port in Sacramento is a necessity; and

Whereas over 2 million people within this trading area would be served with a port in the heart of the Central Valley; and

Whereas the movement of huge resources of raw materials and man-grown products would in many instances be expedited to the ports of the world; and

Whereas the construction of a deepwater port would prove of inestimable value during periods of national emergencies, particularly so, if other Pacific coast ports were destroyed or discommissioned: therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce strongly recommends that the Sacramento-Yolo deepwater channel and port be constructed and that the Federal Government make available the necessary funds for the building of this port vital to the economy of the great Central Valley in the time of peace and to the Nation in times of national emergencies; now therefore, be it further

Resolved: that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Sacramento-Yolo Port District; Senator William F. Knowland; Senator Thomas Kuchel; and Congressman Clair Engle.

DONALD H. GOODRICH,
Vice President, Presiding.
WALTER G. DRYSDALE,
Secretary-Manager.

Resolution passed unanimously by the Board of Directors of the El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce February 8, 1955.

OROVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Oroville, Calif., November 8, 1954.

ROLAND HUGHES,
Director of the Budget,
Executive Building, Washington, D. C.

Maj. Gen. SAMUEL D. STURGIS,
Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C.

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Hon. JOHN MOSS and Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
Members of Congress.

The Sacramento deepwater channel project was authorized in 1946 and date of completion scheduled for 1953. Due to the outbreak of the Korean war, construction work started in 1949 was curtailed shortly thereafter.

Due to the steadily growing population and increased agricultural productivity throughout the Sacramento Valley, the need for port facilities at Sacramento has become imperative. Further, the lack of terminal rates on intercoastal shipping to and from Sacramento results in an ever increasing loss to shippers and receivers of freight in the entire valley.

For the above reasons, we feel it is vital that work on the channel project be resumed at the earliest practicable date.

May we urge that a maximum appropriation be included in the budget for the next fiscal year sufficient to cover the work which can be accomplished in that period, in order that the earliest possible completion date of this important porject may be scheduled.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND A. LEONARD, *President.*

RESOLUTION No. 14,436, SACRAMENTO COUNTY OFFICE OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Whereas the Sacramento River deepwater ship channel project was authorized by Congress under Public Law 525, 79th Congress, 2d session, approved July 24, 1946; and

Whereas in conformity with the requirements of this law, local interests were required to furnish right-of-way easements, spoil-disposal areas, and other necessary local participations; and

Whereas the electors of the Sacramento-Yolo Port Districts approved bonds totaling $3,750,000 on November 4, 1947; and

Whereas the State of California appropriated $750,000 toward the project; and

Whereas the Federal Government made an initial appropriation in 1948 to start construction of the project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Sacramento urges your honorable committee to approve and recommend an appropriation for the Sacramento River deepwater ship channel project of at least $2 million so that a construction program may go forward as rapidly as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That Charles W. Deterding, county executive of the county of Sacramento, be authorized to submit this resolution to your honorable committee and speak from the county of Sacramento.

Passed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Sacramento, State of California, this 29th day of April 1955, by the following vote, to wit: Ayes: Supervisors Bonetti, Elmer, Hoffman, Kelley, Garlick. Noes: None. Absent: None.

[SEAL] JAS. R. GARLICK,

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Sacramento, State of California.

Attest:

C. C. LARUE, *County Clerk.*

By WM. H. DICK, *Deputy Clerk.*

STATEMENT OF LEWIS H. DAY, GENERAL MANAGER, GREATER SACRAMENTO, CALIF., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

I am Lewis H. Day, general manager of the Greater Sacramento, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, an organization composed of more than 2,000 business and professional people. The Sacramento-Yolo Port idea originated in this organization and the port development has long been sponsored by the chamber.

It is our belief that the original plan was economically feasible. We still believe, after the recent survey by the Army engineers, that it is an economically sound project. We believe, however, that it is extremely wasteful for the Federal Government to continue to let this project remain in an uncompleted state. The millions of dollars already spent by both Federal and local agencies will be wasted unless the project is completed.

Our need, from a business point of view, can be pointed up, I think, quite simply by telling you that on this 3-week trip of mine from California through the Middle West and East, I have talked with the top executives of two nationally known concerns who have plans to build west coast manufacturing plans. In each case, I was asked: "What is the status of the port project?" In each case the spokesmen for these two firms said flatly:

"Your part of California has a strong appeal for us. Frankly, we would not be hesitant if we could be assured that your port project would be completed in a reasonable length of time."

As you all know, California is growing at a tremendous rate and we must provide, in some way, jobs for those thousands of newcomers. Completion of the Sacramento-Yolo Port project would enhance our opportunities to provide the jobs that are badly needed.

Thank you for the time allotted us. Your serious consideration of our problem, which is immediate, is deeply appreciated.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 2, 1955.*

Congressman JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee Panel on Appropriations,
House Committee on Public Works:

Regret my Washington schedule prevents my appearing personally on behalf of appropriation for Sacramento River deepwater channel project. My administration has consistently supported this project and I take this means of indicating my continued favorable interest and the need for prompt action on further appropriation for a project which will have a most favorable economic effect throughout northern California.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor of California.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

COYOTE VALLEY RESERVOIR, RUSSIAN RIVER PROJECT

WITNESSES

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
J. MERVYN DAW, SANTA ROSA, CALIF.
LEIGH SHOEMAKER, PETALUMA, CALIF.
HARRY W. FALK, JR., REPRESENTING MENDOCINO COUNTY

Mr. EVINS. We will now be pleased to hear Congressman Scudder, a very personable representative and a very able representative from the State of California.

Mr. SCUDDER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have a brief statement to make, and then I will introduce to you the witnesses who have come here for this hearing.

My name is Hubert B. Scudder. I represent the First Congressional District of California, and I appear before you today with representatives from Sonoma and Mendocino Counties to present to you some of the facts concerning the construction of Coyote Valley Reservoir which is an integral part of the Russian River project.

This project is located in Sonoma and Mendocino Counties, Calif.: was authorized under Public Law 516, 81st Congress, and the local interests, under the provisions of the law are required to contribute the sum of $5,598,000 in cash toward the construction of this project.

On May 10 the voters of Sonoma County must fulfill their requirements under the law. The law provides:

* * * That prior to starting construction, local interests shall contribute the sum of $5,598,000 in cash in full repayment of the conservation benefits: *And provided further*, That such contribution of $5,598,000 shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Army for application to the cost of construction of the project.

You can see that this is a very sizable amount of money for which the local interests are obligated. While it will not be known until after the election whether the people sanction this local obligation, nevertheless, we would desire, and I believe it only right and proper,

that the Federal Government make provision to start construction immediately because of the fact that the interest payment alone will amount to a sizable obligation on the district. I trust that this committee will recommend an amount sufficient for the Engineers to start as quickly as possible to get this project underway.

During the past several years, while we have been securing planning money for this project, it has been brought out at various hearings, the worthiness of the same. The project has been approved by the Congress; it has the approval of the Corps of Army Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget, as well as local interests. Planning has been completed. The project is now ready for construction.

I appreciate the kindly consideration by the committee during the past several years, and feel that we should now carry the project to construction. I also appreciate the time your committee has allocated to representatives of the district and myself.

I would like to present at this time, Mr. Chairman, Mr. J. Mervyn Daw, Santa Rosa, Calif., chairman of the Santa Rosa Board of Public Utilities, and chairman of the Sonoma County Water Advisory Board, a former mayor of Santa Rosa, and a man much interested in the welfare of the county.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Daw, come around and have a seat, and you may proceed.

Mr. DAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a prepared statement, and I would like to supplement that by a brief oral statement.

Mr. EVINS. You may submit your prepared statement for the record, and then proceed with your oral remarks.

(The statement of Mr. Daw is as follows:)

THE RUSSIAN RIVER PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, I am J. Mervyn Daw, of Santa Rosa, Calif.; chairman of the Santa Rosa Board of Public Utilities, and chairman of the Sonoma County Water Advisory Board.

The Sonoma County Water Advisory Board consisting of key men throughout the county of Sonoma was appointed by the board of supervisors a year ago.

They were charged with the responsibility of reviewing volumes of reports prepared by local engineers and financial consultants relating to the Russian River project. They were also authorized and did employ qualified men to make further studies of present and potential needs of agriculture, domestic industry, and recreation from this source.

The advisory board early this year submitted their findings and conclusions to the board of supervisors approving the project and recommending a plan for the financing thereof. The plan was adopted by the board of supervisors acting also as trustees of the duly organized district known as the Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

A special election to authorize the issuance of bonds to finance the project has been set for May 10, 1955.

Something in excess of $100,000 has been invested in said project by local interests through tax funds and voluntary cash contributions. Tax funds for engineering reports, financial studies, economic surveys, and election costs: Voluntary cash contributions of approximately $6,000 for publicity and education.

The city of Santa Rosa, now serving water to approximately 30,000 people, has made a firm commitment to the water conservation district to participate in the amortization of the costs of said project by the purchase of water at a minimum cost of $40,000 annually. This commitment is contingent upon the delivery of water on or before April 30, 1960. Failure to obtain additional water from this source by said date may well create a critical shortage of water for local domestic and industrial use. The city is now dependent upon wells for

90 percent of its output. At the present time the city is defendant in a civil action by a group of farmers seeking an injunction against present and future use by the city in their respective areas.

The city of Santa Rosa is also entering into a mutually agreeable contract between our city and the Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District which will provide for diversion works and transmission lines much needed at the present time for our city. This will at the same time provide adequate facilities for extension to the other municipalities as well as proposed water districts generally throughout Sonoma County.

The advisory board has accepted full responsibility for publicity and public education as to the merits of this plan. Definite progress has been made in gaining public support but the outcome may yet be doubtful.

Members of advisory group are confident that the bond issue in the amount of $5,650,000 will be authorized if our people can be assured that Federal funds for continuing the work will be included in the current budget.

Therefore, we respectfully urge an early and favorable action by your committee, recommending the necessary Federal appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. DAW. In our area water is our No. 1 problem, as it is in the State of California, and perhaps most of the Nation.

We are in an agricultural area within the county, and we find that the urban population is competing with agriculture for a limited supply of water, known ordinarily as underground storage.

We realize that we cannot continue to do this, because we are in direct conflict now with agriculture. Actions are now pending to enjoin the city from further depletion of the underground water available. Civic leaders throughout the county believe that this Russian River project offers the best solution to all our problems, both from the standpoint of flood, conservation or agricultural use, domestic use, industrial use, and recreation.

We have been diligent in our efforts to promote this project at the local level. Over $100,000 has been expended on plans and specifications to bring this to a fitting climax or culmination by an election which has been set for May 10. We have endeavored to bring this about at an earlier date, Mr. Chairman, and we ask your indulgence, because of bringing it in at such a late period, at this session of Congress, but because of circumstances beyond our control we could not do it otherwise.

This is also a project of such magnitude that we cannot hope to proceed without some opposition from people who already have water sufficient for their needs, and that segment of our society which is against all taxation, regardless of the merit of the proposition which may be presented to them.

We are appearing here today in the hope of implementing and to expedite the construction of this great project in the interest of the greatest good for the greatest number.

Mr. Chairman, we ask your indulgence, and hope that you may give some favorable action in regard to this important plan.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Daw.

Mr. SCUDDER. The next witness is Mr. Leigh Shoemaker, a member of the Board of Supervisors of Sonoma County, the county that will pay the large part of the local participation.

I would like to present to you Mr. Shoemaker.

Mr. EVINS. We shall be glad to hear from Mr. Shoemaker at this time.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Thank you, Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Chairman, I am Leigh Shoemaker, supervisor of Sonoma County, director of the Sonoma County Flood Control and Soil Conservation Board.

I have here a prepared statement, of course, but I feel that there are a few observations which I should make, and which would take me just a moment.

However, I would like to submit for the record my prepared statement.

Mr. EVINS. Without objection, it will be received for the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

THE RUSSIAN RIVER PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, I am Leigh Shoemaker of Petaluma, Calif., a member of the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors, and a director of the Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

The Russian River flood control project was approved by Congress in 1950 under Public Law 516, chapter 188, 81st Congress.

Since that time, Congress has made appropriations for survey and plans, much of which has been completed by the district Corps of Engineers.

Local interests have proceeded with plans to the extent of calling a special election for May 10, 1955 for the purpose of voting bonds in the amount of $5,650,000 to pay in full the costs of said project allocated or charged to local interests.

Our purpose in appearing before you at this time is to report to you as concerns developments on the local level and seek further financial encouragement from our Federal Government for the next steps of this program.

The citizens of Sonoma County are acutely aware of the need of the Coyote development but an indication by you of further and substantial activity during the next fiscal year is needed now.

As you are no doubt aware, the long awaited North Barrier plan for development in San Francisco Bay has been at least temporarily disqualified as a source of water for fast growing Sonoma County. We are now faced with no alternative but to turn to the Coyote plan which our engineers have assured us will solve our domestic water problem for many years to come.

The indicated rejection of the North Barrier plan is of such recent date (March 30, 1955) and of such great import that the flood control and recreational potential of the Coyote plan has at least been temporarily shelved. However, much stronger feeling favorable to the plan has been evidenced in the past few weeks. An extremely long dry period in February, March, and April has given us cause for concern. This, in addition to the prospect of little or no summer runoff in the Russian River for 1955.

The aforementioned observation should be considered solely as being additional data for your study of the Russian River or Coyote Dam project. Previous data prepared by the Corps of Army Engineers has been filed with you.

In summation we report that there is a much stronger public acceptance because of the more definite indication of need, and that a very substantial financial encouragement is needed at this time which, of course, means a favorable action by you.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed with your oral remarks, Mr. Shoemaker.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. I am here, of course, at the sanction of my board of directors, and I have voice for them.

The thought that occurs to me is that you are, perhaps, not interested as a committee, sitting as you are, in any pressure, nor certainly in any lobby attempts on our part, but there are a couple of things which would bring up the status quo in your mind, as concerns the Coyote project in Sonoma, and Mendocino Counties.

Over the past several years, since this program was adopted by this Board in 1950, there have been certain developments which took place.

Populationwise, we have had a tremendous growth in California. I believe you are aware of that. We are building presently a large bridge connecting Richmond at San Quentin Point, which will mean an augmented population in Sonoma and Mendicino Counties.

There has been over the past several years a study being made of the north barrier plan for development in San Francisco Bay, but momentarily that project has been disqualified as being a project to be accomplished and adopted in the very near future.

About 6 or 7 weeks ago I attended a water symposium, presented by the State of California in Sacramento, and presentations were being made by groups of State hydraulic engineers, in fact, eight of them, and they presented a rather vivid and vast program for water development of the State of California. We feel that this committee should be apprised of this, and that it has reached a point where we might call it a "point of urgency." We now beseech you to carry on the work, and we feel that actual construction is now about to the point where it should be undertaken.

We feel that the people of Sonoma and Mendocino Counties have satisfied themselves that in their own contract that this is the great water project for our area, and we feel an urgency at this time, and we trust that you will give it honest and sincere consideration.

We feel that we are now ready to commence.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Shoemaker, for your statement.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. Thank you very much.

Mr. HAND. Will you, Mr. Shoemaker, or someone, inform me precisely as to the issue which is now before the people on this election which is to take place on the tenth of this month?

I want the precise question which is before the people on May 10.

Mr. SHOEMAKER. The precise question is on two proposiions. Proposition A, "Shall Sonoma County proceed to bond itself to the extent of $5,650,000 for the creation and the construction for participation of Sonoma County with Federal funds to build Coyote Dam?"

Proposition B is a group of different progress developments for distribution of this water; (*a*) where shall we build a system which would take the water to Santa Rosa, which is the largest area in Sonoma County, and then propositions (*c*), (*d*), and (*e*); "shall we allow ourselves to be bonded to take the water into Sonoma, into Petaluma, and into other areas at a future date by self-liqudating bonds?"

Mr. HAND. None of these questions has yet been decided?

Mr. SHOEMAKER. They will not be decided until May 10, sir. As Mr. Daw pointed out, there has been, and obviously, there probably would be on any subject of this type, a little opposition by people who have their own water resources. I think you would understand that.

However, until the time when we left Sonoma County last Saturday morning, I personally was not aware of any organized opposition on the part of the electorate of Sonoma County; it is not organized. There are, of course, some individuals who oppose it. That is, as of Saturday morning.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. HAND. It does. Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Are there any further witnesses, Mr. Scudder?

Mr. SCUDDER. I would like to present Mr. Harry W. Falk, of Mendicino County, attorney, representing the Chambers of Commerce of Ukiah and Hopland.

Mr. EVINS. We shall be glad to hear from Mr. Falk.

You may proceed, Mr. Falk.

Mr. FALK. Mr. Chairman, my name is Harry W. Falk, Jr., and I am representing Mendicino County, and I am here under the sponsorship of the Chambers of Commerce of Ukiah and Hopland.

I have some remarks which I have prepared for the record.

Mr. EVINS. They may be received for the record at this point.

(The statement is as follows:)

To: The Congress of the United States.
From: Harry W. Falk, Jr., representing Mendocino County and sponsored by the Chambers of Commerce of Ukiah and Hopland.
Subject: Projects for flood control and allied purposes on Russian River, Mendocino County, Calif.

Although Sonoma County is voting May 10 on the question of bonding itself for the entire local interest portion of the construction funds, Mendocino County is reserving the right to pay $633,200 of the local interest money.

This portion of the local-interest money could be raised by a bond issue, following a vote of the people, either in Mendocino County as a whole or on a local district basis.

Mendocino County has a legally created and functioning district covering the county as a whole. This, under existing law, could be, and was, created by action of the board of supervisors without a vote being necessary. However, since only the southeasterly portion of the county will have any direct benefits from the construction of the proposed project, private interests have moved to create a local district.

Following the California law in this respect, these private interests have delineated the boundaries of the proposed district and are circulating the required petition. This petition must be returned to the board of supervisors signed by at least 15 percent of the voters in the district before an election can be called to create the district and authorize a bonded indebtedness. It is estimated that there are 6,000 voters in the proposed district and that over 2,000 have signed the petition requesting the formation of the district. That is more than twice the necessary 15 percent.

It is felt that unless Sonoma County votes favorably and Congress authorizes the Federal funds, that the expense of actually voting to create the district would not be justified. However, the efforts outlined above have been undertaken in anticipation of favorable action in Sonoma County and by the Congress so that Mendocino County will be prepared to vote immediately.

A poll taken by the Ukiah Chamber of Commerce of its 350 members showed a ratio of approximately 20 to 1 in favor of the construction of the project.

Mendocino County has made a considerable study of the project, and has gone to a great deal of expense. It employed a consulting engineer, John Cotton, to report on the project insofar as the interests of the county were concerned. In September 1953 Mr. Cotton made his report recommending participation in the project by Mendocino County interests.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed with your oral remarks, Mr. Falk.

Mr. FALK. The dam under consideration is to be built in our county, which is Mendocino County. The prior two witnesses were from Sonoma County, although Mr. Shoemaker represents both of our counties, as well as some additional counties.

The Sonoma County vote on May 10 involves their putting up all of the necessary funds from the local district, but there are changes whereby Mendocino County may vote, and put up a portion of the funds, $633,200, to be exact.

We have, so far, proceeded to the point where we have delineated the district, and are circulating a petition which would result in the district being created under our California law, the district being authorized to bond itself for its share of the bonds. There are about 6,000 votes in the district, and we need 15 percent, or 900 of those people, on the petition to qualify.

At the present time we have over 2,000 signatures on the petition. So, it looks rather favorable. Our chamber of commerce, which has 350 members, polled its membership recently, and they voted about 20 to 1 in favor of the construction of the project. However, there is not much point in Mendocino County going ahead, nor Sonoma County voting favorably, unless the Congress appropriates the funds.

Personally, I feel that the dam is a fine thing, and that Congress should help us out, and create a water supply which is very badly needed.

At the present time we have a rather artificial water supply, in that during the summertime aproximately 50,000 people who live along the river are entirely dependent upon the water in the river, which comes from another watershed.

If that supply failed, we would have a catastrophe almost of national scope on our hands. We want to assure that supply, and increase it to a certain extent with this Coyote Valley project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Falk.

Mr. SCUDDER. That is about all, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say a word or two further.

Mr. EVINS. Permit me at this point to state that your Congressman, Mr. Scudder, has been most industrious and most active in this regard, and if his work has anything to do with determining the vote which is coming up out there, soon, I am sure he favors it, because he has been most active.

Mr. Scudder, have you discussed this matter with officials of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. SCUDDER. Not at this point. I have talked with the engineers. The engineers have told me, rather off the record, that they could use about $2 million during this first year. They must secure the rights-of-way and purchase properties and do the preliminary work, but they feel they could use about $2 million this year.

Of course, you realize we are in a rather uncertain position by coming to you now, because of the fact that the people have not voted on the bond issue, but we do want to get started. If the district sells almost $6 million worth of bonds, they are going to have to pay interest on the money, and we would like to see the project get started as quickly as possible.

Mr. EVINS. That is the next question which the committee wanted answered, as to how much you feel could be expended properly within the next fiscal year by the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. SCUDDER. They say about $2 million.

Mr. HAND. Why do they have to pay interest on the amount of the bonded money, Mr. Scudder?

The point of my question is, of course, whether a mere authorization is equivalent to a sale of the bond.

Mr. SCUDDER. According to the law authorizing this project we are required to make a lump sum payment, the law provides, and I desire to quote for your information, in order to clear up that point:

> Prior to starting construction, local interests shall contribute the sum of $5,598,000 in cash in full repayment of the construction benefits, and provided further that such a contribution of $5,598,000 shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Army, for application to the costs of the construction of the project.

In other words, we have obligated ourselves to put the money on the barrelhead for construction of this project.

Mr. HAND. To phrase my question a little differently, which comes first, the chicken or the egg?

If this bond issue is authorized by the vote of the people on May 10, I do not know whether the local government thereafter has any discretion. They must go ahead and prepare the issuance of the bonds, but in any event, I would presume that they do not have to sell until they have some further assurances.

Mr. SCUDDER. That would be my opinion also, but we are so close together in these two factors, and coming before the start of the next fiscal year, if we could get this money it would allow the engineers to go ahead with their program which they have developed. The Federal Government has put $550,000 into surveys in bringing it up to that point where they can start construction, and construction of the project is very essential to the welfare of the entire area. I know you cannot approve it today, but maybe some time, before the bill comes on the floor for passage we will have the necessary information.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Scudder. I am sure the committee will give your request serious consideration.

Mr. SCUDDER. Thank you very much.

Mr. JENSEN. I believe you said that local interests had contributed a certain amount of money for the development of this project, or would appropriate a certain amount of money?

Mr. SCUDDER. Yes; under the act, and we were brought in under the general omnibus bill which passed in 1950, it provides that we would put up our contribution toward the project in a lump sum by selling bonds to cover that cost.

Mr. JENSEN. For what percentage of the project?

Mr. SCUDDER. Well, $5,598,000.

Mr. JENSEN. What is the total cost of finishing the project?

Mr. SCUDDER. The total cost at that time was estimated at something over $18 million.

Mr. JENSEN. This is strictly a flood-control project, as I understand it?

Mr. SCUDDER. Yes, sir. However, there is stream stabilization, there is recreational advantages which will accrue, and there is a natural percolation because of maintaining the constant flow of water; the best repayment factors to the county will be the sale of domestic water and irrigation water.

Mr. JENSEN. You are to have an election on the 10th of May?

Mr. SCUDDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. For what purpose is the election to be held?

Mr. SCUDDER. The purpose of the election is to vote on the bond issue.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Scudder, I remember a few years ago you came in here and tried to keep us from spending money at one time.

Mr. SCUDDER. Well, I will still do that, Brother Jensen. I am for economy all the time, and I believe local government should put up as much as they possibly can, or as much as their economy will stand.

Mr. JENSEN. I think that is quite commendable.

Mr. SCUDDER. That is my attitude all the time.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate that expression.

Mr. EVINS. I think you made a fine statement, Mr. Scudder.

Mr. SCUDDER. Thank you very kindly.

(The following telegram was received at a later date.)

SANTA ROSA, CALIF., *May 11, 1955.*

Hon. JOSEPH EVINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee, House Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Sonoma County voters on May 10th endorsed bond issue of $5,650,000 for local interest share Coyote Valley project by 3 to 1 majority. Urge inclusion sufficient funds in current budget to complete plans and start construction during coming fiscal year.

JAMES F. LYTTLE,
Chairman, Board of Directors, Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL

WITNESS

HON. ALBERT THOMAS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear next from Congressman Thomas of Texas. We are pleased to have a statement from our friend and able colleague, who is also a very senior member of the Committee on Appropriations, and a very valued Member of Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. And I might add, a gentleman of the highest order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, and my friends, may I start off by saying that I do not want your job.

Mr. JENSEN. You have a similar position on the same committee, Mr. Thomas.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. THOMAS. Gentlemen, some 12 or 15 years ago the House passed a flood-control project for the city of Houston, Tex., which involved three bayous. We call them "bayous" down there.

Two of them are big creeks, and the Houston ship channel is the middle one. There are 2, 1 on each side, which finally empty into the Houston ship channel. I might say that I have seen water 2 or 3 feet above the banks at that point. However, that situation has been taken care of. The one on the north has been taken care of, and the one on the south is the one which is giving trouble.

That is the one which passes next door to Rice Institute, the Shamrock Hotel, a $50 million medical center, and a veteran's hospital which has 1,000 or 1,200 beds, and I can mention many hundreds of millions in property affected.

What is creating the ruckus right now is the fact that the entire section is growing so far and so fast that we cannot keep up with it. We have one-million-plus people in my district. I do not get out and advertise it, but it is three times too large.

They are building in what they call the median reach of the bayou which we are talking about, and which was authorized, and passed in the bill last year, to rectify this situation, a $24 million project, with $12 million in local contributions and $12 million as a Federal contribution.

They are continuing to build residences down there right now. There are over 1,000 houses under construction, and they have planned

for the next 12 months alone another 3,000. There is one subdivision which plans to put in there 16,000 houses. It will be a town of 50,000 people. Can you imagine that?

Mr. EVINS. They do things in a big way in Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Well my county is growing.

Mr. EVINS. Well, you are making a great contribution toward the well-being and welfare of Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. It is growing, and I do not see anything to stop it.

However, here is the problem. There is no money in the budget this year, and I understand we cannot put money in this year's budget for every project. I understand that. However, here is what I would like:

The Corps of Engineers owes the county a few dollars short of $3 million which the county put up for other work, you see.

Do you understand? There is no argument about the money. The county has not made any demands for its return. The county put it up, hoping to get this other project started 5 or 6 or 7 years ago, but they had to change the plans on this one, which we are now worrying with. That is the reason why they have not spent the money. The county has not made any demands to return the money, and is not going to do so. The Corps of Engineers does not question that they owe the money.

So, what I would like to do is to spend up to $3 million to get this thing started in fiscal year 1956, and either spend the $3 million which the corps owes, but then, I must state that I have taken it up with the Bureau of the Budget, and off the record——

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. THOMAS. If it is embarrassing to try to dig up the $3 million, the local community will put it up, and there will be no questions asked about the other $3 million until the proper time.

I have drawn up language which would cover our situation, as follows:

Up to $3 million of local funds may be used by the Corps of Engineers to begin construction on Brays Bayou, Harris County, Tex., during fiscal year 1956.

So, it will not get the budget out of balance, and it will not add anything to your bill. I would rather use the $3 million, but I am afraid the corps could not use it, because Mr. Hughes told me, frankly, that they had not scheduled in their plans the use of that $3 million and that it might muddy the water.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. THOMAS. This amount of money which I have previously mentioned has been owed to my county 5 or 6 or 7 years. There is no dispute about that. No one is screaming about it either way. The corps has it and they say "We owe it," and we say "We know you do." We are not asking them to hand us the cash back.

Mr. EVINS. You are asking that this fund which they have be now expended in order to put the project into a construction status?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir; this year, up to the amount of $3 million, and if it is embarrassing for them to use that $3 million, we will supply the $3 million.

Mr. EVINS. You have made a very persuasive statement.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. JENSEN. What did you say the total cost of the project would be to the Federal Government?

Mr. THOMAS. The total cost would be $24 million, and it would be handled by a local contribution of $12 million, together with a contribution of $12 million from the Federal Government.

Mr. JENSEN. I understand; of course. Thank you.

Mr. HAND. They expect someday to pay you back?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; they expect to pay back the $3 million, whenever we can get this other work started. The reason they have not started it is because the country has grown so fast during the last 8 or 10 years that we had to change the plans on this second bayou. It took the Corps of Engineers a couple of years to do that.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Thomas, for your presentation.

(The following letter was received at a later date:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1955.

In re Brays Bayou, Houston, Harris County, Tex.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Western Division,
Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I enjoyed my appearance before your distinguished subcommittee yesterday. By way of followup, permit me to give you these few lines to augment my statement of yesterday.

We desire to get this project started this year because of the potential danger of causing many millions of dollars worth of damage in case of floods. In case of a flood, damage would occur to Rice Institute, a $50 million medical center, a 1,200-bed veterans' hospital—not to mention hundreds of other pieces of property. The Corps of Engineers owes Harris County slightly less than $3 million. These funds were advanced by Harris County some 4 or 5 years ago for work done on another tributary of Buffalo Bayou. Concerning those funds, I quote from a letter written March 8, 1955, by our distinguished friend, Rowland Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which in part reads as follows:

"We fully agree that reimbursement of funds previously advanced by the Harris County Flood Control District is authorized by law * * *."

Mr. Hughes states that the expenditure of this $3 million has not been budgeted for this year. In order not to cause the Bureau of the Budget any embarrassment, Harris County is willing to advance another $3 million as part of its contribution to get the work started during the ensuing fiscal year. It is my understanding this work will cost $24 million—one-half of which will be paid by Harris County.

Since there are no funds in this year's budget, I requested the subcommittee yesterday to place the following language in this year's bill, which will enable the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the construction work without calling for any Federal expenditures this year:

"Up to $3,000,000 of local funds may be used by the Corps of Engineers to start construction on Brays Bayou, Harris County, Texas, during the fiscal year 1956."

Bear in mind that it is not our intention for the Corps of Engineers to use the $3 million of Harris County funds now in their hands—but to use an additional $3 million to be advanced by Harris County. It is my understanding that the Corps of Engineers cannot expend more than $3 million during the fiscal year 1956 on this project.

I hope the language set out above is placed in this year's bill.

With every good wish to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT THOMAS.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

CRESCENT CITY HARBOR

WITNESSES

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS B. CROWLEY, OIL TERMINALS CO., UNITED TRANSPORTATION CO., AND SHIP OWNERS & MERCHANTS TOWBOAT CO.
BRADLEY PAGE, SECRETARY-MANAGER OF THE DEL NORTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
WILLIAM H. FOSS, TRAFFIC MANAGER, A. C. DUTTON LUMBER CORP.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will now hear from Congressman Scudder with respect to projects in the State of California, and his district, in which he is interested.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have a short prepared statement. The item which we are talking about is the continuation of the construction of the jetty at Crescent City Harbor. This item is in the budget, and has been recommended by the Corps of Engineers and by the Bureau of the Budget, but I always feel it is well to come before the committee and make ourselves available for questions or suggestions.

Mr. Chairman, I am Congressman Hubert B. Scudder, representing the First Congressional District of California.

First off, I would like to express my appreciation, and that of the people of Del Norte County, Calif., for the consideration extended by this committee last year in approving the inclusion of $500,000 in the civil functions bill to commence work on the modified breakwater at Crescent City Harbor.

As a result, the Corps of Engineers has been able to start work on this important project which, when completed, will make Crescent City Harbor a safe coastal port. Lumber and bulk petroleum are the main products passing through the port, and it is also a base of operations for a sizable commercial fishing fleet. It is the only improved port of refuge between Humboldt Bay, Calif., and Coquille, Oreg., a distance of 140 miles of rugged coastline.

The modified breakwater design was adopted by the Corps of Engineers. The modified plans are designed to meet the demand for present and prospective harbor needs, and accomplish the desired results more economically.

There is included in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1956, a recommendation of $1 million to carry on the work already started. This amount, along with the appropriation of last year, aggregates over half of the total estimated cost of the breakwater project and will expedite construction.

I request the favorable consideration of this committee in sustaining the $1 million recommended for Crescent City Harbor in the budget for fiscal year 1956.

I have a telegram from Fibreboard Products, Inc., of San Francisco and would request that this telegram be made a part of the record. This firm is a large user of Crescent City Harbor and supports the

budget recommendations for funds for continued improvement of the harbor.

Also, I have three witnesses whom I desire to present to the committee for statements in favor of this project.

(The telegram referred to is as follows:)

FIBREBOARD PRODUCTS, INC.,
San Francisco, Calif., April 27, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT SCUDDER,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

(For transmittal to chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works, House Appropriations Committee, 84th (1st) Congress.)

We urge your favorable action in approving the Corps of Engineers' recommendation for $1 million in the budget for continuing the construction of the Dog Leg jetty, Crescent City Harbor, Calif.

The improvements on the jetty are vitally needed to allow the barge movement of wood now being wasted to our pulp mill at Antioch, Calif. The utilization of this waste wood is of tremendous importance to the long-range economy of the Crescent City area in particular and to the State of California in general. We again urge your favorable action.

(Signed) ROBERT E. BUNDY,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Scudder, you may now introduce your witnesses.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to present at this time Mr. Bradley Page, the secretary-manager of the Del Norte County Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Page.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have a short prepared statement, and with your permission I would like the balance of this report to become a part of the record.

Mr. EVINS. It may be added to the record.

Mr. PAGE. My name is Bradley Page. I am the secretary-manager of the Del Norte County Chamber of Commerce, with offices in Crescent City. I am privileged to speak for the Board of Supervisors of Del Norte County, the City Council of Crescent City, and the board of harbor commissioners of the Crescent City Harbor District, as well as the board of directors of our chamber.

We respectfully urge the retention, in this year's budget, of the $1 million appearing there for the improvement of Crescent City Harbor for the following reasons:

Of the 642,000 acres total area of Del Norte County, 449,000 acres, or approximately 70 percent, is federally owned. Fifteen thousand acres, or approximately 2 percent, is State owned. This leaves 178,000 acres remaining, or only 28 percent, which is privately owned and which must carry the tax burden of the county. Such facilities as are being made available through the improvement of Crescent City Harbor are most important factors in the support and in the expansion of the economy of Del Norte County. This industrial growth also permits the area to accept its normal share of the approximately 2,000 persons, daily, who migrate to the coastal areas of California. It encourages a healthier distribution of population and is inclined to help relieve some of the congestion in the metropolitan areas.

Crescent City Harbor has become such an integral part of the economic and industrial planning of southwestern Oregon also that the Grants Pass and Josephine County Chamber of Commerce shows

Crescent City as their seaport in their latest industrial brochure, a copy of which is attached hereto. We also include a copy of a letter from this same chamber of commerce, indicating the importance of Crescent City Harbor to the economy of that area. Also attached and made a part of this statement is the text of an editorial appearing in the Grants Pass Daily Courier of April 8 of this year, containing excerpts from an article, setting forth the importance of Crescent City Harbor to all of southwestern Oregon, which appeared in the Oregon Business Review. These were entirely unsolicited and strongly indicate the thinking of the industrial leaders in that vast area, with respect to our project at Crescent City.

Our own economy, as well as that of southwestern Oregon, is becoming continually more dependent upon Crescent City Harbor. Percentagewise, ours is the fastest growing harbor in the United States. Last year I was privileged to point out to this committee that we enjoyed an increase of 14,670 percent in harbor tonnage in 3 years. This year we show an increase, in 4 years, of 18,885 percent with a tonnage increase of nearly 100,000 tons in this past year. We feel that this is a convincing example of good American enterprise taking full advantage of the help so far given by our Federal Government.

Facilities are being added to the harbor, commensurate with the Government's improvements thereto. For example, application has been made to the Corps of Engineers for a permit to construct a ship chandlery and marine railway. Application has also been made by Sause Brothers Ocean Towing Co. This company has leased additional land from the city of Crescent City, adjoining their present operation, for the purpose of enlarging their facilities, at an estimated cost of $250,000.

Experiments, also, are being conducted in the water shipment of plywood, the results of which indicate that in the very near future methods of handling will be developed, making it entirely feasible to use water transportation for this product, which will be more convenient and far more economical.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Page, we shall insert into the record such portions of the balance of your statement as are acceptable to the committee.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Timber resources to logically move through Crescent City Harbor (As listed by the United States Forest Service)

	Board-feet
Six Rivers National Forest	12, 315, 306, 000
Siskiyou National Forest	11, 600, 000, 000
Private ownership (Curry County, Oreg.)	3, 000, 000, 000
Private ownership (Del Norte County, Calif.)	6, 000, 000, 000
Oregon and California land-grant and public domain lands	1, 642, 735, 000
Total	34, 558, 041, 000

All of national forest timber and greater portion of private timber to be logged on a sustained yield basis, thus producing a perpetual cut of over 300 million board-feet annually.

[Editorial from April 8, 1955, edition of Grants Pass, (Oreg.), Daily Courier]

CRESCENT CITY PORT'S IMPORTANCE

The importance to all of southern Oregon of Federal development of Crescent City as a port is laid out in detail in an article compiled by Alfred L. Lomax, professor of business administration, University of Oregon, and published in the Oregon Business Review:

Here are extracts from the outline:

"The present-day contributing hinterland of Crescent City includes 13,000 square miles located in Del Norte County and parts of Modoc and Siskiyou Counties in California, and in sections of Josephine, Jackson, and Curry Counties, in Oregon. The estimated population is well over 100,000 including 15,500 in Del Norte County. Industries in order of importance are: Logging and lumbering recreation and tourists, dairying and stockraising, commercial fishing, flower culture, and mining.

"It is estimated that national forest timber tributary to the port, that is economically available for shipment, is approximately 31.5 billion board feet measure, most of which lies within the Siskiyou and the Six Rivers National Forests. Douglas fir predominates, with hemlock and redwood the other commercial woods.

"The controlling depths in the main harbor basin range from 7 to 27 feet; in the inner fishboat harbor the depth is 11 feet to 27 feet.

"The mile-long bay, open to the south, has benefited by improvements by the United States engineers, since improvements were first authorized in the River and Harbor Act of July 18, 1918. Current and recently completed projects call for: (1) A rubble-mound breakwater 3,700 feet long from Battery Point (completed) and a proposed 'dog leg' at the seaward end of the breakwater running 61° east 1,000 feet (incomplete). (2) A rubble-mound sand barrier from Whaler Island northeast to the eastern shore (completed). (3) An inner breakwater 1,120 feet long northwest from Whaler Island to form a protected V-shaped inner harbor (completed). (4) A basin 1,800 feet by 1,400 feet, immediately east of the breakwater, to be maintained to a 20-foot depth at mean lower low water (completed). (5) Removal of pinnacle rocks in the harbor (completed). (6) Maintenance dredging in the vicinity of the seaward end of the sand barrier.

"The estimated cost of the projects is $7,488,800 which is exclusive of $217,115 contributed by local interests. Approximately $6 million of United States funds is now invested in these improvements; the projects are 73 percent complete.

"The northwestern California-southwestern Oregon section is historically and commercially unified, and is irrefutably a part of the larger Pacific Northwest region which stretches from Cape Mendocino on the south to an undefined northern boundary in Alaska. Crescent City has been the natural distributing point for this segment of the region for approximately a century. It was a depot for the Indian wars of 1855 and for miners supplies needed in the rich gold-bearing streams which coursed out of the mountains. Even heavy machinery was occasionally transshipped at San Francisco for Crescent City and hauled over the winding road as far inland as Ashland, Oreg.

"Of the total lumber produced in the Crescent City area, only about 25 percent goes by water; the balance is marketed by truck.

"All plywood is shipped by truck, mostly to Pacific Northwest markets, although California takes a small portion.

"The principal incoming cargo is refined petroleum, which increased from 133,474 tons in 1951 to 188,653 tons in 1952; petroleum is brought in by non-self-propelled barges of the Oil Terminals Co. of San Francisco."

GRANTS PASS AND JOSEPHINE COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
April 28, 1955.

DEL NORTE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Crescent City, Calif.

(Attention: Bradley Page, Manager.)

GENTLEMEN: The Grants Pass and Josephine County Chamber of Commerce wishes to express its interest and backing in the obtaining of Federal aid for the completion of a harbor at Crescent City.

As you know, this country contributed considerably at the time of the building of the city dock because of our interest in this project. This interest grows stronger day by day.

At the present time, we are working very closely with Medford, Klamath Falls, and Lakeview to obtain a modern highway from eastern Oregon to connect with the Redwood Highway at Grants Pass. The thought behind this action is to give us access to the sea at Crescent City.

Here in Josephine County, as you know, we are, at the present time, working toward the development of the C. & O. C. Railroad, in hopes of having it ultimately extend to Crescent City so that we will have rail as well as highway access to the port in Crescent City.

Should there be anything further we can do to assist you in getting the necessary funds appropriation to develop this port, do not hesitate to call upon us.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Sidney Bazett,
(Typed) SIDNEY BAZETT,
President.

CRESCENT CITY, CALIF., *April 27, 1955.*

DEL NORTE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Crescent City, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: The City Council of Crescent City wishes to go on record as supporting all action of the Del Norte County Chamber of Commerce in the improvement of Crescent City Harbor.

It is our desire also to authorize your secretary-manager, Bradley Page, to represent this council in all efforts and appearances in Washington, D. C., in connection therewith.

A. T. MANUEL,
Mayor.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
DEL NORTE COUNTY,
Crescent City, Calif., April 25, 1955.

DEL NORTE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Crescent City, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: The Board of Supervisors of Del Norte County wishes to go on record as supporting all actions of the Del Norte County Chamber of Commerce for the improvement of the Crescent City Harbor.

It is our desire, also, to authorize the secretary-manager, Bradley Page, to represent this board in all efforts and appearances in Washington, D. C., in connection therewith.

Yours very truly,

FRED D. HAIGHT,
Chairman of the Board.

Attest:
[SEAL]

POLA IVES,
Clerk of the Board.

BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS
OF THE CRESCENT CITY HARBOR DISTRICT,
Crescent City, Calif., April 25, 1955.

DEL NORTE COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Crescent City, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: The Board of Harbor Commissioners, Crescent City Harbor District, wishes to go on record as supporting all action of the Del Norte County Chamber of Commerce for the improvement of Crescent City Harbor.

It is our desire also to authorize your secretary-manager, Bradley Page, to represent this board in all efforts and appearances in Washington, D. C., in connection therewith.

[SEAL]

HERBERT M. MOORE,
Chairman of the Board.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Page.

Mr. PAGE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. This project is in a very advanced stage of completion, and you are supporting the Bureau of the Budget request as reported?

Mr. PAGE. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Scudder, you may now introduce your other witnesses.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I have as a witness Mr. Thomas B. Crowley of the Crowley Tug Boat Co., which is operating in and out of Crescent Harbor.

Mr. Crowley.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Crowley.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record my prepared statement, and then make some additional remarks.

Mr. EVINS. Without objection, the statement will be received.

(The statement referred to follows:)

The Oil Terminal Co., the United Transportation Co., and the Shipowners & Merchants Towboat Co. are engaged in the transportation and terminaling of bulk petroleum products to Crescent City, Calif., for distribution in northern California and southern Oregon.

This petroleum is refined in the San Francisco Bay area and transported by oceangoing barge to Crescent City. This has been made possible in recent years by improvements to Crescent City Harbor by the Army engineers in the form of breakwaters with a resultant reduced cost to the consumer of bulk petroleum products.

The present harbor of Crescent City is still very exposed and necessitates completion of the present dog-leg which was started last year in order to make it a safe port.

We wish to appear in support of the request for an appropriation of $1 million to enable the United States Army engineers to continue the construction of the dog-leg breakwater. During the past year, the engineers have constructed about 300 feet of the breakwater. This has shown a small improvement by reduction of swell in the harbor but the primary benefit will not be realized until the entire breakwater is completed.

The cost of stopping operations and continuing again in the future is approximately $200,000 for setting up the gear and, therefore, it is sound economic policy to continue the present work until completion.

Our tugs and barges have an extremely difficult time getting in and out of the harbor and laying at our wharf while pumping out because of the large amount of swells caused by the present inadequate breakwaters. We sometimes lay off the port 3 or 4 days waiting for weather to moderate and have on several occasions this last winter been forced to put to sea before we were pumped out because of the increase in swells. This delay is costly and adds to the transportation cost which could be further reduced with improved port facilities.

In 1951, a total of 130,000 tons of petroleum products were barged by us to Crescent City and in 1952 this jumped to 185,000 tons. In 1953, it further increased to 200,000 tons and in 1954 went slightly over this figure. This is slightly more than $20 million worth of petroleum products annually transported, stored, and then distributed through Crescent City Harbor.

We have also been aproached by the fiberboard products for the transportation of chips from Del Norte County to the fiberboard pulp plant at Antioch but have been forced to await the completion of the dog-leg breakwater before this operation would become practicable. In the meantime, these chips and wood wastes being produced in the Crescent City area are being burned in sawdust burners instead of being put to a use in the economy of the country. This waste of forest products cannot be overcome economically until the improvement of Crescent City Harbor is completed.

There are very large quantities of lumber shipped out of Crescent City Harbor due to the fact that the present breakwaters have been constructed and more lumber will move as soon as the additional dog-leg is completed. This lumber mainly originates from stumpage sold by the Forest Service which returns a direct dollar value into the hands of the Federal Government which will more than repay the cost of these harbor improvements in a relatively short time.

We urge that this appropriation be made immediately in order to continue the present work on the most economic basis. This, in turn, will keep the cost of transportation of bulk petroleum products into the entire northern California and southern Oregon area at a reasonable level and will utilize our natural resources of timber more completely by converting wood waste into pulp.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, as has been noted, I have submitted a written statement, but I did not read it. I will just briefly mention it.

We are in the transportation business and transport about 200,000 tons of petroleum products annually to Crescent City, which is distributed in southern Oregon, in northern California, and which transportation has resulted in a reduced gasoline and diesel oil price for the people in that area.

We make this transportation under substantial difficulties, because of the open condition of the harbor.

We feel that harbor improvement is necessary for further traffic through here. Such improvements would be of tremendous benefit to the local area. The Forest Service, incidentally, has a tremendous amount of trees, as Mr. Page has pointed out. They are able to sell these trees at a substantial return to the Government for logs, because of the fact that the harbor improvements are there.

So, as I say, the Government is directly getting back money which they expended in this harbor improvement.

Although the fiberboard company operates a big kraft pulp plant in the San Francisco Bay area, they require wood waste for making this pulp, which is presently being accumulated in Crescent City, but with further harbor improvements it could be shipped to San Franciso and we could further utilize our forest resources, and it sould be done for the good of the people.

Are there any questions which you care to ask?

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, the next witness I have is the traffic manager for the A. C. Dutton Lumber Co., and he will present his views on this project.

The Senate committee has called for me, and I will take my other group over to the Senate committee. I appreciate the consideration which you have given us today.

Mr. EVINS. We are pleased to have your statement, Mr. Scudder.

Mr. SCUDDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Foss, you may proceed, with your presentation in behalf of A. C. Dutton Lumber Corp.

Mr. Foss. Thank you very much. I would appreciate having my prepared statement made a part of the record, and then I will only touch upon it.

Mr. EVINS. Your entire statement will be received for the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

My name is William H. Foss. I am traffic manager of the A. C. Dutton Lumber Corp., Poughkeepsie, N. Y. Last year I had the privilege of appearing before the committee in support of a request for $500,000 to enable the engineers to commence construction of a dog-leg jetty approximately 1,460 feet long, extending southeast from the seaward end of the existing breakwater at Crescent City. Statements which I submitted at that time were made part of the record and contained vital facts in support of this additional construction to provide adequate protection to shipping using Crescent City Harbor. I do not feel that it is desirable or necessary to take time to reiterate the facts which have brought about the urgency of providing adequate protection at Crescent City. However, for your convenience and to alleviate the need for reference to the printed record, I have included as exhibit A, a copy of the statement which I have submitted previously. My appearance before the committee this year is in support of the request made by the Corps of Engineers that $1 million be appropriated in the 1956 budget to enable them to continue the present construction without interruption.

Because of the great difficulties under which shipping operates in and out of Crescent City Harbor, our barging program from Crescent City to Los Angeles, Calif., has continued along the limited lines followed in 1953. In 1954 our lumber shipment over our dock at Crescent City totaled 16 million boardfeet, or 20,800 net tons, representing approximately $1,200,000 AST value. The demand for larger utilization of our dock and mill facilities at Crescent City for shipment into the California market is a continuing one, limited largely only by the difficulties brought about by the inadequacy of the present harbor with the loss in barging time and the resulting high cost of operation. While time remaining under the working season last year only permitted the construction of approximately 300 feet of the dog-leg jetty, nevertheless there is already evidence of the increasing protection to be experienced as construction progresses. In due time, a considerable amount of the surge which is presently experienced by barges and equipment lying along side our dock will be eliminated and conditions during the heights of the seasonal storms will be such as to offer proper protection to the barges lying alongside the dock during such periods of storm. Presently, barges are either forced to stand off the dock in tow in confines of the harbor or to stand off outside awaiting favorable conditions. One operator even resorts to the extremes of filling the tanks of his converted LST barges so as to rest the barge on the bottom during loading operations after which he refloats the equipment by unballasting. Needless to say that his repair cost in fairing bottom plates and frames is excessive. The loss of turnaround will be eliminated with adequate harbor protection, which will effect substantial savings to the barge and towboat operators and will allow them to provide effective and economical service competitive with other ports, which is so sorely needed.

We are not unlike other companies operating in and out of the Crescent City Harbor in that while we are struggling to maintain a semblance of operation we are forced to withhold from consumating plans for future development projects. Specifically, in our own case, we have been approached by Fibreboard Products, Inc., to formulate a wood-chipping service between our Crescent City mill and Antioch, Calif. As you gentlemen know, Fibreboard is a large producer of paperboard and paper products and is presently constructing a new plant at Antioch. Their chief problem is to provide an adequate and consistent supply of wood chips for such an operation. We have mutually discussed the problem of supplying wood chips by barge from our operation at Crescent City to Antioch, Calif. This contemplated operation entails the investment of approximately $1 million. In order to be economically feasible, this operation will necessitate the construction of 2 barges 250 feet long by 54 feet beam capable of handling 1,600 units of chips. Under the present conditions of inadequate protection at Crescent City it is not only impractical but impossible to handle barges of this size alongside our dock at Crescent City. Therefore this program must be held in abeyance until such time as the harbor is adequately protected from surge and storms by proper and sufficient breakwater construction. In the meantime, thousands of dollars and tons of material are going up as smoke, as waste in the burner, which could be otherwise put into the bloodstream of the economy. In conclusion, may I reiterate that the need for adequate protection in the Crescent City Harbor is, if anything, even greater today than at any time in the past. It would not only permit the transportation for an ever increasing volume of lumber which is sorely needed by the economy both on the west coast and on the east coast but would enable the further and very considerable development of other commodities such as indicated by our planned wood-chipping program and the increased volume of petroleum products as contemplated. This type of expansion is bringing ever-increasing benefits to the economy of Del Norte County and to the State of California, reaching as far as the Atlantic seaboard, to which we move approximately 40 million feet of lumber from the Crescent City area each year.

Last, and in no wise least, it must be borne in mind that the Federal Government through the offices of the United States Forest Service, are reaping benefits derived through the sale of Government timber. This alone, aside from any other consideration, is an impressive figure inasmuch as 52 billion board-feet of Government timber as indicated by United States Department of Forest Service is tributary to Crescent City.

Recent sales of Government-owned timber in the Crescent City area indicate a price of $16 per thousand board-foot upward. This project continues to be a self-liquidating one in every respect.

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT OF A. C. DUTTON LUMBER CORP. IN SUPPORT OF REQUEST FOR $500,000 TO BE USED FOR BREAKWATER CONSTRUCTION AT CRESCENT CITY, CALIF., 1954

My name is William H. Foss. I am traffic manager of the A. C. Dutton Lumber Corp., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Last year I had the privilege of appearing before both the House and Senate Subcommittees on Appropriations in regard to improvement to Humboldt Bay Harbor, Calif. At that time I submitted statements [1] which contained in considerable detail the facts surrounding the diminishing lumber economy of the Pacific Northwest and its infiltration into northern California and southern Oregon to develop the last great timber resource in this Nation. Contained in the statement also evidence attesting to the inadequacy of the then existing transportation facilities which were crippling the economic development of this great new area, and denying very substantial revenue to the Federal and State government.

Crescent City Harbor is the remaining obstacle in the path of a greatly expanded economy in northern California today. Since the record contains all the available data necessary to support our request for funds for breakwater construction at Crescent City, in the interests of conserving time of this committee, I shall not incorporate such data in this statement. I propose to speak to you, however, about the fundamental problem of the situation in which we—the Dutton Lumber Corp.—together with others, find ourselves mutually with respect to Crescent City Harbor.

At the close of World War II it became apparent first that timber resources of tidewater mills in the Pacific Northwest were rapidly reaching depletion and if the Corporation were to continue to supply the eastern seaboard in time of peace as well as in war it was necessary to look elsewhere if it were to survive.

After careful survey both with information supplied by the National Forest Service and private services it was decided to tap the virtually untouched reserves of the Siskiyou National Forest in southern Oregon and the Six Rivers National Forest in nothern California. This plan called not only for a combined sawmill and planing mill operation but a capable transportation system as well since this vast resource of timber existed solely because of the lack of adequate transportation. Branch rail lines servicing this area are separated by 226 miles of mountainous territory. The capacity of the operation which we envisioned demanded a transportation system that could handle expeditiously and economically 120 million board-feet per year; approximately 18 million feet direct by barge from Crescent City to southern California markets, the remaining 102 million feet board measure moving by barge to Eureak on Humboldt Bay, thence via ocean vessels to the 5 Dutton terminals on the eastern seaboard. Therefore, simuletaneously with the erection of a sawmill and planing mill, the corporation erected a substantial causeway and dock at Crescent City, and a dock at Eureka, Calif., together with a terminal for transhipment to the east coast—a combined investment of $2,850,000. An additional half million dollars was invested in an oceangoing towboat and 6 LSM's which were converted into barges. The purpose of the fleet was to haul the lumber from our Crescent City mill to Eureka and also the southern California market. Careful comparison of costs indicated that even on a limited production of 48 million, this method of transportation the first year would show a substantial saving of approximately $200,000, and $600,000 with a full production of 120 million feet.

Notwithstanding a curtailed production in 1952 on account of log supplies and the operating difficulties which are always encountered in new mills, as a direct result of the program for development of Crescent City and Humboldt Bay, the Dutton Corp. moved by barge during the period of January 1951 to March 1, 1953, 35,069,112 feet board measure, or 44,593 tons. Other barge and lumber interests accounted for 55,623 tons in 1953 and with the advent of the Oil Terminal Co. of San Francisco and its 7-million-gallon tank farm and a far-reaching program extending well into the hinterland, the harbor has enjoyed 188,653 tons of refined petroleum products.

Unfortunately, this growing increase and stimulus to the economy has not been without disastrous consequences to those who are most responsible for the

[1] References: Hearings before House Subcommittee on Appropriations, 83d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, pp. 21–39. Hearings before Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, 83d Cong., 1st sess. on H. R. 5376, pt. 2, pp. 1130–1152.

increase. Speaking solely for the Dutton Corp. whose experience is not unlike the experience of the others, the carefully estimated saving in transportation cost of $200,000 to $600,000 never materialized. The unpredictable delays to loading at Crescent City on account of surge the year round, coupled with southerly storms prevailing during the winter months, raised costs beyond all proportion. A towboat must be kept in continuous operation if it is to be an instrument of economy. Day after day of enforced idleness during the four winter months is prohibitive. High insurance costs to cargo and equipment could not be offset when the overall operations were at the mercy of the elements. Even under moderate weather conditions the surge causes damage to both barges and dock and makes the loading operation extremely hazardous.

The Dutton Corp. has had to curtail barge operations by 48 million feet per year. The fleet, representing an investment of $500,000, has been placed for disposal at 50 percent less than its value. The carrier who is presently engaged in barging our lumber to southern California is greatly concerned over its ability to stay in this service due to the severe risk to equipment while it is loading in Crescent City Harbor at the mercy of the elements.

The one great determining factor which affects the entire Del Norte and adjacent counties economy is that of securing prompt and adequate protection to the harbor provided through breakwater construction. The main breakwater has been extended until at the end of the 1950 working season it was approximately 4,200 feet long. The December storms that year almost completely destroyed the outer 500 feet and the second 500 feet of length was considerably damaged. The pictures which I have distributed will give you gentlemen a brief but vivid idea of the force of the storms which occur in this area and the very evident lack of adequate protection against them. This particular storm caused $8,000 damage to our causeway. One of our barges which was moored to our dock tore loose and proceeded to tear a gaping hole through an adjacent dock before coming to rest on the beach. This rampage cost us very close to $50,000. Heavy losses were suffered by the fishboat owners as well as by others using the harbor at that time. A Navy barge as you can see by the pictures, was blown ashore during the October 1950 storm, and also a large barge owned by a Portland, Oreg., concern.

The engineers have spent last summer working on a program reconstructing the second 500 feet and strengthening the entire breakwater. The outer 500 feet will not be reconstructed. This work will resume again this spring and will be completed this season. It has been indisputedly demonstrated that any further construction of the main breakwater in the direction of Round Rock would be most undesirable. We have to face the unpalatable fact that after 14 years since the present project was recommended to the Congress that we find the breakwater is but 700 feet longer than in 1940. On the other hand, we find that the community and private interests have again demonstrated by sheer determination in the face of overwhelming odds that the necessity for a safe and adequate harbor is greater than ever. Almost 300,000 tons more than the most optimistic estimates of 14 years previous is currently moving through the harbor.

Failure to recognize the great and growing need of adequate protection to protect this rapidly expanding economy would be to invite disaster. Fortunately, we have at hand a solution to this weighty problem. We have an authorized project in the form of a dog-leg jetty approximately 1,460 feet long extending approximately south 61° east from the seaward end of the existing breakwater. The engineers are fully aware of the need for this construction to commence as soon as possible before further losses are experienced which would cripple the program for development of Del Norte County and its adjacent neighbors. I am advised that the construction of this dog leg would require three working seasons and would cost two-million-six-hundred-thousand-odd dollars. Herein lies our purpose in appearing before you gentlemen today. With only $500,000 placed in the budget, construction of this dog leg can commence this season simultaneously with present strengthening of the main breakwater. Costs should actually be lower since equipment and personnel is already at Crescent City; rock is available. The remaining $2,100,000 is to be spread over the subsequent 2 working seasons. With each foot of dog-leg construction the surge and sanding now so active at Crescent City Harbor will be substantially diminished. Southerly storms will be contained. Eventually the construction of the second dog leg as recommended from Whaler Island to Flat Rock will provide Crescent City with a closed harbor which will in turn provide adequate accommodations to all.

Gentlemen, this request for funds to commence construction of the dog leg at Crescent City and its urgency must be considered from the broad basis on which it rests.

1. Crescent City Harbor is the gateway to a large area in northern California and southern Oregon which is rich in natural resources.

2. The shift of the lumber industry from the Northwest into this general area has created an expanding economy.

3. Many new businesses and small manufacturing concerns are moving into the area.

4. Since 1946 the infiltrating lumber industry has skyrocketed the former total of 2 sawmills only into 75 ultra-modern mills, 16 lumber project plants, and 8 plywood and veneer mills in the area generally considered tributary to Crescent City.

5. The population in Del Norte County alone has increased since 1945 from 4,500 to over 14,000 people in the spring of 1953.

6. Bank deposits have increased since 1950 by 43 percent, and population by 80 percent, lumber production 48 percent, utilities 84 percent. Unfortunately, I do not have available at this time the increase in taxes which accrue to the Federal and State governments. However, the increase would be proportionate to the increase in business generally, and consequently must be considerable.

7. The Oil Terminal Co. of San Francisco has built a 7-million-gallon tank farm for the joint use of major oil companies, and oil barges are importing oil from the bay area refiners for distribution to the northern California and southern Oregon counties. The tonnage involved in this operation alone in 1952 was 188,653 tons and upon the completion of the oil pipeline now under construction to Medford, Oreg., from the tank farm will more than double the oil distribution through Crescent City Harbor.

8. Commercial fishing has expanded from a few boats to a large fleet of approximately 130 craft. Annual fishing tonnage in 1952 represented approximately 4,000 tons (7,954,588 pounds).

In conclusion I should like to suggest that the gains noted above portray a very striking economic development that is taking place today in northern California. Stop and consider the tonnage that was contemplated as being available in the recommendation by the Army engineers before the subcommittee House Document 688, 76th Congress, 3d session, April 3, 1940, in which breakwater construction was recommended and funds sought in the amount of $1,610,000—2,100 tons of fish, 2,500 tons of lumber.

When examined against present accomplishments of close to 300,000 tons moving currently, these figures are no longer simply impressive; they are downright fantastic. Please keep in mind also that the population in 1940 of Del Norte County was 1,720, and today is close to, if not exceeding 15,000.

The gain tonnagewise, and the stimulus to the economy of this particular area must be protected and encouraged to expand.

Congress last year approved funds to implement Public Law No. 549 re Humboldt Bay improvement breaking the bottleneck from which the vast reserves of this northern California area could be released into the economic streams of the Nation. Adequate harbor protection at Crescent City is the remaining link to complete the sorely needed transportation outlet from this area to Eureka; to southern California, and to the eastern seaboard. The project is authorized. Private interests have demonstrated the ability to perform not by promises but by deeds. The impetus to the economy must not be jeopardized by allowing the very considerable investments to remain at the mercy of the elements. Further losses will be reflected in decreased barge and harbor activity.

An appropriation of $500,000 now will not only protect present accomplishments, but will give further momentum to the growing and expanding economy in northern California which in turn has its rightful effect upon the Nation at large.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Foss, you may proceed with your oral remarks.

Mr. Foss. My appearance before the committee this year is in support of the request of the Corps of Engineers that $1 million be appropriated in the 1956 budget to enable them to continue the present construction on this project without interruption.

Because of the great difficulties under which shipping operates in and out of Crescent City Harbor, our barging program from Crescent

City to Los Angeles, Calif., has continued along the limited lines followed in 1953.

In 1954, our lumber shipments over our dock at Crescent City totaled 16 million board-feet, or 20,800 net tons, representing approximately 1.2 million AST value, which will be increased when we have the benefits of better harbor protection for our barging program.

The fiberboard products have already been mentioned by Mr. Crowley, whose company will handle the towing of that operation when it comes into existence.

The fiberboard people have approached us for our supply of chips from our Crescent sawmill, and planing mill, and the operation involves a $1 million investment in barging and milling machinery.

Unfortunately, we cannot go ahead with that program due to the inadequate protection at the present time of Crescent City for barges lying alongside our dock. We hope, as soon as the breakwater construction reaches its finished stage, that we will be able to go ahead with this particular program.

In conclusion, I would like to again reemphasize that in addition to the volume of lumber moving out of that area to the Atlantic coast, in our case, some 40 million feet goes out of the Crescent City area, to our Atlantic coast terminals, it must be borne in mind that the Federal Government, through the office of the United States Forest Service, is reaping the benefits derived through the sale of Government timber.

You gentlemen will be interested to know that the recent sales in the Cresecent City area of Government timber represents a price of $16 per thousand feet, and upward.

At the present time there is roughly, according to forest survey figures, approximately 52 billion feet of federally owned timber.

Mr. Evins. Thank you very much, Mr. Foss.

We thank all you gentlemen for your statements.

Mr. Foss. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

KENNEWICK DIVISION, YAKIMA PROJECT

WITNESSES

HON. HAL HOLMES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

HON. DON MAGNUSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

JEROME CLARKE, VICE PRESIDENT, KENNEWICK IRRIGATION DISTRICT

J. C. PRATT, KENNEWICK PROJECT COMMITTEE

HUBERT H. WALTER, WASHINGTON STATE COLUMBIA BASIN COMMISSION

GEORGE D. ZAHN, WASHINGTON STATE COLUMBIA BASIN COMMISSION

Mr. Evins. The committee will now hear from Congressman Holmes and Congressman Don Magnuson, both of whom are our esteemed colleagues, and both of whom are very able Congressmen from the Northwest area.

Congressman Holmes, I believe you want to present some witnesses?

Congressman HOLMES Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some very distinguishd people here from my area of the State of Washington, who wish to testify on the Kennewick division of the Yakima project.

With your permission, Mr. Clarke will be the first witness.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Clarke, be seated, and you may proceed with your statement.

You may proceed as you wish, and your entire statement may be filed for the record, Mr. Clarke.

(The statement referred to follows:)

The Kennewick division, the sixth and last division of the Yakima project, is now in its third year of construction.

The total cost of the Kennewick division is approximately $13 million, and consists of bringing irrigation water to 14,500 acres of new sagebrush land, and furnishing a firm irrigation supply to 4,600 acres of old lands presently being irrigated by high head electric pumps. Also included is a 12,000 kilowatt powerplant that will produce approximately 80 million kilowatt-hours annually.

To February 28, the project was 55 percent complete with approximately $8 million having been obligated or expended. This fiscal year the division has a total appropriation for construction of $4 million.

With eight contracts presently in force, it now appears certain that all the fiscal year 1955 funds will be used by June 30. In order to complete these contracts in fiscal year 1956, and to start 4 others before October 1955, it is estimated that $3 million will be required during fiscal year 1956.

It is our understanding this $3 million appropriation will enable the Bureau to carry on with their planned program about as fast as contractors generally work, however, if this coming winter is mild the contractors would be able to accomplish additional work. This would be very desirable as it would permit earlier completion of some canal contracts allowing greater time for the priming of canals in the very fine soils common to this area, and would mean earlier use of water and therefore more beneficial use of the land the first crop year. To enable the Bureau to pay contractors for this faster progress, should the need arise, we request the Department to augment the $3 million for fiscal year 1956 by transfer of funds from other projects where fund surpluses may develop during fiscal year 1956.

The attached list shows the contracts now in force and those yet to be awarded:

Kennewick division, Yakima project—Contracts in force by April and those yet to be awarded

Contracts	*Award data*
1. Irrigation canal divisions 1, 2, and laterals	February 1955.[1]
2. Irrigation canal division 3 and laterals	January 1955.[1]
3. Irrigation canal, division 4	May 1955.
4. Amon siphon, hydraulic pump and wasteway	February 1955.[1]
5. Badger and Highlands laterals, sublaterals	May 1955.
6. Chandler power and pumping plant	July 1953.[1]
7. Chandler power and pumping plant (completion).	April 1955.[1]
8. Prosser diversion dam alterations and canal enlargement.	Do.[1]
9. Yakima River channelization	July 1955.
10. Chandler powerplant—operator dwellings (3)	April 1955.[1]
11. Division 4, and Amon laterals	By September 1955.
12. Fencing of Chandler power canal	March 1955.[1]
13. Facilities for operator's dwelling	By September 1955.
14. Miscellaneous supply contracts (30)	Delivery completed by August 1955.

[1] In force, or to be in force by May 1955.

Mr. CLARKE. The Kennewick division, the sixth and last division of the Yakima project, is now in its third year of construction.

The total cost of the Kennewick division is approximately $13 million, and consists of bringing irrigation water to some 14,500 acres of arid, sagebrush land, and furnishing a firm irrigation supply to 4,600 acres of old lands presently being irrigated by high head electric pumps. These existing old lands are irrigated by a 17,000-foot lift in old pumps and old pipelines. It is very important that this project continue, so that we will not have to spend too much money in keeping up this old, dilapidated system.

Also included is a 12,000 kilowatt powerplant that will produce approximately 80 million kilowatt-hours annually.

To February 28, the project was 55 percent complete, with approximately $8 million having been obligated or expended. During this fiscal year the division had a total appropriation for construction of $4 million.

With eight contracts presently in force, it now appears certain that all of the fiscal year 1955 funds will be used by June 30. In order to complete these contracts in fiscal year 1956, and to start four others before October 1955, it is estimated that $3 million will be required during fiscal year 1956.

It is our understanding that the $3 million appropriation will enable the Bureau to carry on with their planned program about as fast as contractors can work. However, if this coming winter is mild, the contractor would be able to accomplish additional work. This would be very desirable, as it would permit earlier completion of some canal contracts, and allow greater time for the priming of canals.

This priming is very essential, and in order to enable the Corps of Engineers to pay the contractors for this vast program in case of a mild winter, should the need arise, we request the Department to augment the $3 million for fiscal year 1956, by transfer of funds, wherever they may be available from other projects.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes the short remarks which I desire to present.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Clarke.

Mr. Holmes, do you wish to present other witnesses?

Mr. HOLMES. I have one other party who desires to testify on the Kennewick project.

He has come 3,000 miles, and I would like to have him have the honor to present his statement to you.

Gentlemen, this is Mr. Pratt, distinguished citizen of the State of Washington and county assessor of Benton County.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Pratt.

Mr. PRATT. Gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here, and I will take just a minute.

I think the most important part in asking for this appropriation which has been budgeted is to see that we do not drop behind schedule owing to the fact that we must prime this canal in the early fall and winter of 1956, in order to bring the water to the lands for the crop year of 1957.

We urge that you give us the support on this, so that we will not lose another farm crop year.

Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Pratt.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hubert H. Walter, of the Columbia Basin Commission of the State of Washington, would like to testify in behalf of the appropriation for the Columbia Basin of the State of Washington.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Walter, we shall be glad to hear you.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement which I would like to file, and then speak briefly on what it means and what we would like to have in the Columbia Basin this coming year.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Walter, your statement will be received for the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF GEORGE D. ZAHN AND HUBERT H. WALTER, OF THE WASHINGTON STATE COLUMBIA BASIN COMMISSION, IN BEHALF OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT AND THE FOSTER CREEK UNIT OF THE CHIEF JOSEPH PROJECT

Our names are George D. Zahn and Hubert H. Walter, both representing the Washington State Columbia Basin Commission, a State commission authorized by an act of the legislature and charged with the responsibility of natural-resource development, particularly as it applies to reclamation and agriculture.

While we are appearing mainly in behalf of the Columbia Basin project and the Foster Creek unit of the Chief Joseph project, we also endorse and urge appropriations for the Kennewick unit of the Yakima project and the powerplant of the Roza unit of the Yakima project. Both of these projects have the unanimous support of the Columbia Basin Commission.

On the Columbia Basin project, the largest reclamation undertaking ever attempted, we have progressed far enough and have enough land under production and sufficient power production to prove beyond doubt the economical, agricultural, and financial stability of this project. No longer can there be any question of the productiveness of the lands, which stood barren for centuries, and of the project's ability to pay off in full the financial obligation, providing the construction work goes ahead on the program which was agreed to by the water users, the Bureau of Reclamation and Congress itself several years ago.

That the Government will get back the money it has invested or may invest in the future seems to us to be shown by the repayment record to date. The Government has put into this project just under $500 million, but this project has returned to the Government $108 million notwithstanding the fact that we have been irrigating with waters from behind Grand Coulee Dam for only 3 years. It is true that most of this revenue came from power sales, but the power sales to help pay off the irrigation obligation were a part of the repayment contract.

We are rapidly approaching the point where the net investment by the Government will be reached. We are asking for $12,500,000 for the next fiscal year to continue construction on this project and keep the development program on schedule, but in the next fiscal year we will return to the Government $12 million. Power sales will enable repayment of $1 million a month. Although this project at completion will cost $775 million, the net investment by the Government, in the opinions of our economists, should never exceed $500 million, and that investment for all practical purposes has been made.

We will be repaying to the Government in direct payments in the future practically as much money as we will need in appropriations to keep the construction program on schedule.

We in the State of Washington must have this project kept on schedule to protect business, industry, and farmers. We have geared our economy to a program calling for from 50,000 to 60,000 acres of new land coming into production annually until at least the first 600,000 acres of the ultimate 1,029,000 acres are under production. We are less than half way toward that 600,000-acre goal. To slow down now would jeopardize the investments made by farmers, businessmen, and industrialists, who have planned and invested, not only for facilities to serve those who now are here, but also those who are yet to come year after year as more land is brought into production.

Private and public sources have invested or made available for investment more than $125 million since 1946, the first year of construction work on the irrigation features of this project. We did so willingly, realizing that we in the State of Washington had an obligation to go along with the Federal Government in this development project.

We have spent for roads on the Columbia Basin in the last 5 years $8 million, including a large portion of a $5 million bond issue authorized by the legislature for farm-to-market roads to serve the new farmers. In addition, the last legislature authorized $4,300,000 in new bonds to assure that the State will keep its roadbuilding program on the basin abreast or ahead of the reclamation development.

Schools have spent $8,950,000 in new facilities, not only to provide for those who are here, but for those yet to come. Civic expenditures in addition amount to $5,466,000 since 1946. On all of these, the people are paying interest on bonds, but authorized the bonds in expectation of the schedule being maintained and the facilities being used. If the project is not kept on schedule and the new people do not come into the basin, many of these facilities will not be used, and we will be paying interest on bonds for improvements that are not used, and we cannot afford to do that.

Other expenditures made by private individuals, all in anticipation of continued and orderly development of the basin are: residential and commercial buildings and facilities, $54,800,000; farms and machinery, $28,400,000; and industrial, $12 million.

Investments by local agencies and individuals exceed $125 million to date. The total of these investments will rise above $275 million by 1960 or 1961, if this irrigation development is kept on schedule.

The Federal Government and the State government have benefited by this development. The income-tax payments from the basin area have risen from $5,365,000 in 1946, the year work on the irrigation features was started, to $16,418,000 in 1953, and they will continue to rise as long as the development work is continued. Sales taxes from the basin went from $748,600 in 1946 to $2,131,000 in 1953.

The basin's crop production and its ability to market the crops add to the soundness of this enterprise. The gross crop returns have gone from $4,686,885 in 1952, to $9,081,887 in 1953, and to $16,253,000 in 1954, and the acreage has gone from 27,127 in 1952 to 63,958 in 1953, to 104,327 in 1954. It is expected that the cropped acreage this year will be 160,000 acres. The crop returns are expected to amount to $81 million and livestock production to add another $61 million annually when the 600,000 acres are under water.

Still we have insufficient land under production to establish the safeguards for the basin's farming industry. We have to have processing plants to handle our goods, but we do not have enough acreage under water to assure the production a processing plant must have to establish an economical operation. We do not have enough land in any one area to support enough cows to attract a dairy or milk processing plant. We are assured these plants will come when there is enough livestock population, but until that time comes, the farmers already on the land do not have the outlet for their products that they should have. This same condition applies to other crops.

The water users pay for their water and the operation and maintenance costs, which now are $5.75 an acre. Operations and maintenance are not as efficient as they should be due to the fact that there is insufficient land equipped to receive water. There are barren spots where the laterials have not been built, and therefore the lands cannot be assessed. When these lands are brought into production, the efficiency of the Bureau's operation and maintenance will be increased and the cost of this service will be spread over a wider base.

It is impossible to develop the Columbia Basin too rapidly. The demand for land is heavy and all the acreage for which water is available is taken up quickly. The rate of development here has exceeded that of any other irrigation project. Last year 83 percent of the land eligible to receive water received water. An example of the demand for land is shown by the last announcement of the sale of Government land, strictly to veterans. There were 48 tracts available, and there were more than 3,600 application for them. People are combing the basin every day trying to buy land from private individuals.

We believe that the record of progress shows the soundness and the need for this project, and we sincerely urge that this committee favor the $12,500,000 construction appropriation recommended for the Columbia Basin project.

We respectfully request, too, that the $631,000 recommended for the Foster Creek unit of the Chief Joseph project be granted. This is a new project in north central Washington to serve some of the finest fruit lands in the West. This project would not be a costly one, totaling less than $5 million for completion, but it would enhance the economy of the area many times more than the $5 million total cost.

This project became possible due to the construction of Chief Joseph Dam by the Army engineers. This dam raises the surface of the Columbia River to a point where it is feasible to pump water to the fertile lands nearby. Construction of this project would make possible profitable farm homes for people who now have difficulties producing crops from the soil.

The State of Washington has an outstanding record in reclamation. Here were the first projects to repay the Government in full on its investment in reclaiming the land. The Tieton and Sunnyside units of the Yakima Valley were the first to pay out in full, and they did so ahead of the due date. The State's population has increased 48 percent since 1940, and our agricultural production has not kept pace. As a result, crops produced in these projects for which we are asking funds will find a strong market right at home. Even with the Columbia Basin's 600,000 acres, the State's agricultural production will not increase more than 20 percent.

Washington's reclamation record is one of the best in production and repayment. Still we stand thirteenth in the reclamation West in acres reclaimed.

The Columbia Basin Commission urgently requests that this committee support the $12,500,000 for the Columbia Basin project, the $3 million for the Kennewick unit, and the $631,000 for the Foster Creek unit.

Mr. WALTER. We are far enough along now on the Columbia Basin project, which is the largest irrigation project ever attempted, to show that it is a paying proposition.

We are asking and hoping for $12.5 million to keep this project on the schedule of from 50,000 to 60,000 acres of land coming into production annually, until at least the first 600,000 acres of the ultimate 1.029 million acres are under production.

We are asking for $12.5 million, but we also are returning to the Government $1 million a month. We have repaid, through power revenues mainly, over $100 million on a project which will cost about $775 million, but we are at the point where the net investment on the Columbia Basin probably has been made. It is unlikely that the investment will ever go above $500 million, and we are approximately at that point at this time.

By that I mean that our revenues from this project and from the Grand Coulee Dam itself, are returning substantially the same amount as we are asking for year after year. So, we believe that it is a paying proposition. We have now about 247,000 acres under water. We have terrific demand for more land, and we are still running about 400,000 acres short of the first half on this project. The land demand is terrific.

The Government lands are being sold to veterans on a priority basis.

Forty-eight tracts were put up for sale recently, and there were 3,600 applications for those tracts. The people are combing the Columbia Basin constantly searching for land to buy. We need more land. Eastern Washington can hardly survive without reclamation, and it is one of the most successful reclamation regions in existence. It is here where the first Federal projects repaid the Government in full, and now we believe the Columbia will pay off.

We have proven that this can be done, that it is a good State, and it is a good reclamation State.

Still, we are 13th on the list of the Western States in acreage under reclamation. Our population since 1940 has grown 48 percent. While we are producing good crops, we are finding much of our market right at home.

We are urging that you go ahead and complete this on schedule, and we request $12.5 million for the coming fiscal year.

The Columbia Basin Commission, which I am representing, is a State organization, set up by the legislature for natural resources development, and while I have spoken here in behalf of the Columbia Basin project, this organization which is composed of directors of the irrigation district elected to this commission, plus three members appointed by the Governor, we are giving wholehearted support to the Kennewick unit, and the Foster Creek unit of the Chief Joseph project, and to the Roza.

We would like to have all of those kept on schedule, because we have proven that it is good land, good business, and that we can pay out.

Thank you very much.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Walter.

The Columbia Basin project is one of the great projects of the Nation, which this committee has followed with great interest, and which I know this committee in the past has very generously supported.

Mr. WALTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. EVINS. I am sympathetic with the general statements which you have made, because I believe that the returns into the Treasury show that your project is a paying project, returning money into the Treasury annually, while benefiting the people of your area a great deal.

Mr. WALTER. We appreciate that very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for those remarks.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, another member of the Columbia Basin Commission, Senator George D. Zahn, State senator of the State of Washington, would appreciate an opportunity to testify for a few minutes on Foster Creek.

Mr. EVINS. Senator Zahn, we are very glad to have you with us.

Mr. ZAHN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Congressman Holmes.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I, too, am a member of the commission, as well as being one of the State senators from the State of Washington, and I would like to concur in my colleague, Mr. Walter's, statements, relative to the Columbia Basin project.

That is the commission's stand, and the commission's study, and we are grateful for your words on those matters.

Regarding the Kennewick project, I would like to add my testimony in support of that, and, of course, the Roza project, when we come to it.

Specifically, and not to take the time of the committee, the Foster Creek project is one of our newer small projects, for which I believe there is a budgetary appropriation of $631,000, and I would like to just briefly acquaint the committee with some recent developments out there which indicate how that is moving.

There is 1 irrigation district ready now for contractual obligations with the Government; there are 2 more being formed there in this section, comprising in 1 district just under 3,000 acres, and in the other 1, just above 600 acres, both lying rather close to the dam, within 12 miles of extreme points. Pumping plants will utilize electric energy in accordance with the Chief Joseph legislation, which you gentlemen know better than I could tell you.

The legislation allows the use of kilowatts from Chief Joseph Dam for some help in the pumping projects. The elimination of costly

canals there, and going entirely to pumping, has made this a much more favorable project.

The Bureau has a small office there, and by the time this appropriation, which is up to you gentlemen's decision, could be utilized for contribution to help districts now being created, in addition to the one already now formed will be ready for contractual obligations, to proceed. That land will be utilized largely for fruit production, which are not in surplus production. It is a fruit-producing area, with warehouses and other facilities already located in the district for packing and storing of fruit crops.

This area did not have its normal return in 1949 and 1950, since there were some serious tree damages which cut its production materially. These lands are at a level which will be out of the frost belt, leaving the remaining land to be used for pasture crops, which will not be frost-affected.

So, it would be enhancing the entire economy of that area to move this project along as rapidly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Senator Zahn.

I want to state for the record that your representatives have been industrious, and certainly active in these matters, and Congressman Magnuson has spoken to me several times about the proposition, and Congressman Holmes has also.

In addition to what I said earlier, I have been interested in your Roza project, which the Corps of Engineers has testified about, and I would like for some of you gentlemen to enlighten us briefly for the record as to the situation on the need for power in that area.

Mr. HOLMES. We are having a party to come in and testify on the Roza project on the afternoon of May 5, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. It is my understanding that more than $1 million has been expended, looking forward to that development, but that it has been stopped.

Congressman HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. There is a substantial interest and need for that project's ultimate development.

Mr. HOLMES. That is right, sir; and we are going to have Mr. Ross Morris to speak on that project before your committee on the afternoon of May 5. I likewise am going to testify according to the schedule on projects including Roza on that same day.

Mr. EVINS. All of you gentlemen are supporting your Congressmen in requesting just the amount of money which the Bureau of the Budget has approved for these items?

Mr. ZAHN. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. I have no particular question, but I would like to say that this is the 13th year that I have heard about the great Columbia River Basin project from the standpoint of a committee member. I think Congressman Holmes will agree that a few years ago there were certain people in the administration who saw fit to delete the Kennewick project from the budget request, and the committee, of which I was a member, saw fit to put it right back in.

From that day on, the Kennewick project has been going forward.

I have traveled all over the country of the Columbia River Basin with members of the Bureau of Reclamation, and with Congressman

Holmes, and other Congressmen out there, a number of years ago, and I saw great possibilities in that great basin.

I do not hesitate to pat myself on the back a little, and the rest of the committee, who felt the same way. I think the appropriations which we have made for the entire Columbia River Basin, and in fact, for the entire State of Washington, will substantiate the fact that the Congress has been nice to your State.

Will you agree, Mr. Holmes?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes, sir; I certainly do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It has done very well by us, Mr. Jensen.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JENSEN. It has now proven that we were not mistaken, and the thing which I want to do as soon as I can is to take another trip through that great basin, and see the progress which has been made.

That is going to be one of the pleasures of my life.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Please come this time as my guest, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. JENSEN. I will just be happy to accept that invitation, Congressman Magnuson.

Mr. ZAHN. Mr. Jensen, it even astounds us who live there to drive into it day by day, and see it blossom.

Mr. HOLMES. An invitation is cordially extended to you, and we will see to it that you live up to your expressed desire.

Mr. EVINS. We would like to hear from our colleague, Congressman Magnuson.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to prolong this hearing. I will avail myself of an opportunity to testify on behalf of these projects, and I am here to lend my moral support to the requests which have been made by these fine people from my State, as Congressman-at-large from the State, and a member of the Appropriations Committee, and a member of the subcommittee of Public Works of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. EVINS. And, I should add, a very valued member of the Committee on Appropriations. As you indicated, you represent not only this particular district, but the entire State of Washington, as I understand it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. We thank you, Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, may I express to you my thanks and appreciation for the courtesy which the committee has extended to these gentlemen.

Mr. ZAHN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You have always been very good to us.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

HORSESHOE BEND, MERCED RIVER

WITNESS

HON. B. F. SISK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear Congressman Sisk of California. We are most pleased to have him appear before the committee at this time.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I appear here today on behalf of the Horseshoe Bend project on the Merced River in California, and I would like to summarize some statements which I have. I shall be brief.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed with your oral remarks, Mr. Sisk.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, this is a further development on the Merced River by the Merced Irrigation District in Merced County, Calif.

The Merced Irrigation District was organized in 1919, and shortly thereafter erected Exchequer Dam, which had no particular flood control facilities. It was erected purely for irrigation and power purposes. That cost the sum of $22.5 million, and of course they are dependent upon that for their irrigation water.

At the present time, it gives them water at something like $1 per acre-foot which, of course, is very reasonable for water in our particular area.

Due to the growth of the irrigation district, they have proposed to build what we call the Horseshoe Bend project, which is another dam just above Exchequer Dam, and it will store from 700,000 or 800,000 acre-feet of water. They also propose to put in a powerplant. They propose, of course, to build that on the same basis that they built Exchequer, furnishing the finances themselves, but in view of the fact that it will have a number of flood-control features, and that it, of course, is a much larger project than the Exchequer Dam project was, and that there will be some effect on the lower level basin where the Merced River enters the San Joaquin River, they have found that it is necessary to review the work of the Army engineers on it, due to its flood-control features.

I might say that as early as 1939 the Secretary of the Army and the Army engineers made some studies and then those studies were reviewed to some extent in 1944.

At the present time, and in view of the immediate need for additional water, due to the growth in the irrigation district, and so on, they are asking for a restudy of those plans in order that they may be brought up to date, and that, if possible, the project might be put on the road as rapidly as possible.

We have statements by Colonel Starbird, and by others of the Corps of Engineers, that they are wholeheartedly in favor of making this study, and it is estimated by the western regional office that this restudy, in its entirety, would cost about $100,000. There are some who feel that it would be considerably less.

My purpose in being here before you gentlemen today is in the hope that we might be able to get some $20,000 or some $25,000 authorized for an immediate start of this study. It is felt by the people in the regional office out there, of the Office of Army engineers, that that amount would adequately see them through the first year of this study.

So, for that reason, I am here today asking that the first year of this study receive as much consideration as possible and, if it is at all possible, to include it in the amount set aside for this year.

There are a number of other things which I could say with reference to the productivity and so forth of the District, but Mr. Chairman, may I ask, if it is permissible, I have some two statements here, which I would like to file for the record, if that is in order.

Mr. EVINS. They may be received, Congressman Sisk.

Mr. SISK. One of these is a statement which I made to the Public Works Committee myself, and the other is a statement made by Mr. Kenneth R. McSwain, who is chief engineer of the Merced Irrigation District, Merced, Calif., also a statement made to the Public Works Committee here in Washington.

Mr. EVINS. Those statements may be received for the record.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF KENNETH R. MCSWAIN, CHIEF ENGINEER OF THE MERCED IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MERCED, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Kenneth R. McSwain. I am chief engineer of the Merced Irrigation District located in Merced County, Calif. I have been with the district 23 years and in my present position for over 11 years.

I am here to request that the committee authorize a review report by the Corps of Engineers on the plans for a multiple-purpose development on the Merced River at Horseshoe Bend, and make available the sum of $100,000 to the Corps of Engineers for the purpose of pursuing its studies.

The Merced Irrigation District presently owns and controls Exchequer Dam and Reservoir on the Merced River about 23 miles northeast of the city of Merced, Calif. The reservoir capacity is 281,200 acre-feet and the hydroelectric plant develops up to 35,200 kilowatts. The mean annual runoff of the river at Exchequer is about 1 million acre-feet. Exchequer Dam was built for irrigation and power purposes; any flood-control benefits are purely incidental, and are only by virtue of the existence of the structure across the river. We are neither physically nor legally able to operate specifically for flood control.

The present proposal is for the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir at Horseshoe Bend, upstream from the existing Exchequer Reservoir. The dam would be 460 feet high, impound about 900,000 acre-feet of water and cover an area of 7,000 acres; the powerplant would generate 65,000 kilowatts. Operation of the project would be integrated with that of Exchequer in all phases of irrigation, power production and flood control.

The district includes 164,000 acres of irrigated lands, which annually requires in the neighborhood of 600,000 acre-feet of water from the Merced River. Agricultural development and attendant water use have so increased during the past several years that a more dependable irrigation supply is imperative. With present storage facilities, anything less than a 70 percent of normal flow of the Merced River results in impaired crop production and if the flow is down to 50 percent, it means financial disaster for most of the 3,000 farms served by the district, as we have no storage capacity to hold over water from wet years to dry ones. There is no question as to the market for additional hydroelectric energy, as California's needs in this respect are growing every day.

In 1939 the Corps of Engineers studied the development and reviewed the figures in 1944. At both times the results indicated an unfavorable benefit-cost ratio, although in 1944 it was almost unity. Since that time, costs and benefits have changed considerably, due to the tremendous increase in population and development of the area. The Merced Irrigation District has made some preliminary studies at its own expense which indicate that a cooperative Federal-local development may be entirely feasible. The district proposes to build the project itself and carry the costs of water and power development up to the amounts consistent with the benefits derived therefrom. The flood-control reservation would be financed by the United States and the project operated by the district within the framework of an agreement with the Corps of Engineers.

While the district has already spent about $44,000 in its studies, it is not within our ability to attempt an investigation of flood-control benefits and costs. This is partly due to the fact that the Merced River is a tributary to the San Joaquin River. The latter has a much more complicated flood problem, the solution of which will take into account the operation of a number of Federal and locally owned projects. The Corps of Engineers is the only agency capable of making studies and recommendations of such wide scope.

It is my understanding that before any Federal funds can be expended on a project of this nature, studies must be made to determine its overall feasibility and to protect the investment of the United States. The Corps of Engineers is the appropriate agency for making such determinations.

I wish to emphasize that this would be a joint Federal-local project with full participation in the portions chargeable to irrigation and power by the Merced Irrigation District, a publicly owned body existng under the laws of the State of California. The district plans to finance, construct, operate, and control the irrigation and power features of the project but is requesting that the United States investigate the flood-control features so that all the public funds used will be spent to the best advantage. While it may be possible to ignore flood control in our planning, such an omission has never been considered seriously; I feel that it would be extremely shortsighted to do so and that it would be contrary to the principles of orderly water development in California and the Nation.

IRRIGATION

The district will be able to deliver irrigation water every year until October 15 under the development plan. Our present works only provide sufficient water to last until about July 1 in subnormal years such as 1924, 1931, and 1934. It is probable that this year we will be out of water in July, as precipitation has been extremely light.

The best available information reveals a market value loss to the community of over $6 million when we stop irrigation in July.

POWER

Power could be generated at Horseshoe Bend when irrigation water is not required and the water impounded at Exchequer Reservoir downstream, where it could be released through the Exchequer turbines during the irrigation season. We estimate that the average annual energy from the 2 plants would amount to about 350 million kilowatt-hours.

FLOOD CONTROL

The capacity of the Merced River channel is about 5,000 cubic feet per second. When the flow exceeds this amount there is heavy damage to valuable agricultural lands, homes, roads, and bridges. The mean annual flood damage is estimated at $106,000 per year on the Merced River alone. This does not include damage on the San Joaquin River which may be attributed to the erratic discharge of the Merced; destruction on the San Joaquin may well exceed that on the Merced.

Damaging floods have occurred many times since Exchequer Dam was completed in 1926. The greatest discharge was 24,000 cubic feet per second in December 1950.

In our preliminary studies we planned flood-control reservations that would provide a maximum discharge of 5,000 cubic feet per second below Exchequer, which should afford good protection along the Merced River and also on the San Joaquin. This figure is only our best estimate and is subject to revision by the Corps of Engineers.

With flood-control features included in the development it would be possible to utilize the existing Exchequer Reservoir in connection with the new reservoir. This has been impossible in the past because of our limited capacity; any significant flood-water reservations would jeopardize our yields of water and power.

FILINGS

The district has filed an application for additional storage and for increased power generation on the Merced River with the Division of Water Resources of the State of California. These applications were filed December 23, 1954, and are No. 16186 and No. 16187.

On February 28, 1955, we filed an application for a preliminary permit (No. 2179) with the Federal Power Commission, as United States lands will be flooded.

WORK ACCOMPLISHED BY MERCED IRRIGATION DISTRICT

We have estimated our water requirements for the time that the district reaches its ultimate development, and we have determined the total storage necessary for a firm irrigation supply.

We have made studies of power production, using monthly records over a 30-year period of measured river discharge, and applying our ultimate irrigation needs thereto.

A more or less arbitrary flood-control reservation was considered when this work was done, as noted under flood control.

Preliminary filings have been made with the State and Federal Power Commission, as heretofore stated.

We have recently completed a survey of the proposed reservoir site, the maps being on a scale of 200 feet to the inch and showing 10-foot contours.

These data are all available to the Corps of Engineers if your committee authorizes a review report and provides funds for the work.

To date the district has spent $44,000 on its investigations and I firmly believe that the Merced Irrigation District Board of Directors intends to pursue the studies to a satisfactory conclusion as to the projects feasibility.

CONTINUATION OF STUDIES

As soon as we have determined the reservoir capacity more accurately from the maps we have recently received, a more detailed check should be made on the geology of the reservoir and dam site.

A preliminary dam design should be prepared and the power output figures should be refined.

While the district is willing to undertake this work it is almost impossible to obtain any degree of accuracy until the flood-control factors are determined. For this reason it is absolutely essential to our planning to have the Corps of Engineers enter into the work at the earliest possible date. The full cooperation of the district is assured.

EXTRACT FROM RESOLUTION, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MERCED IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Whereas the existing storage facilities on the Merced River are inadequate to supply necessary flood control on said river and the San Joaquin River below the mouth of the Merced River; and

Whereas flood damages along the Merced and San Joaquin Rivers amount to many thousands of dollars annually; and

Whereas the Merced Irrigation District owns and controls the major irrigation and power dam on the Merced River and finds it periodically insufficient to supply the district's needs; and

Whereas it is the sentiment of the board of directors of the Merced Irrigation District that immediate steps should be taken to investigate the feasibility of additional irrigation and power development and flood control on the Merced River, and offers its cooperation to the United States Government in this respect: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works of the United States House of Representatives be requested to authorize the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, to conduct a review study of their past investigations on the Merced River.

I, Kenneth R. McSwain, duly appointed secretary pro tem of the board of directors of Merced Irrigation District, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the board of directors of Merced Irrigation District held on the 1st day of June 1954.

In witness whereof I have hereunto affixed my hand and the seal of the said district, this 4th day of June 1954.

KENNETH R. MCSWAIN,
Secretary pro tempore.

[SEAL]

STATEMENT OF B. F. SISK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, APRIL 25, 1955

Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to appear before your committee on behalf of a proposal which may lead to the kind of project I am sure we all can endorse, where the Federal Government may participate with local interests in conserving and developing our natural resources under a cooperative propram.

We are asking you to authorize the Corps of Engineers to make a study of a proposal to build a dam near Horseshoe Bend on the Merced River of California to find out whether it is feasible and practical, and if so, what benefits would result. If it is a good project, the Merced Irrigation District proposes to pay all the costs of irrigation and power benefits, and will ask you to undertake payment for flood control and other benefits properly chargeable to the Federal Government.

Mr. Kenneth R. McSwain, who is the chief engineer of the Merced Irrigation District, has been sent here by the people of the district to tell you about the

technical and engineering questions and what the district's plans are. His statement shows clearly they are not asking for a handout and that they already have spent a large sum of their own money in developing this project. Now their hands are tied. Only the Corps of Engineers can determine how this project will fit in with the corps' other plans on the Merced and San Joaquin Rivers, and how much benefit the Federal Government will receive from it. Without this study and the information it will provide, the district cannot proceed. I would like to tell you something about this district, what it has accomplished, and why I think you will want to cooperate with them.

The Merced Irrigation District is located in Merced County, which is in the heart of the Central Valley of California. It includes 164,000 acres of fine farming land, all except 15,000 acres or so being in production. This is a land of small farms, averaging 30 to 40 acres, which are intensively cultivated by the families owning them. It is a fine, stable community, long established, progressive, and developing.

The district was organized in 1919, when it became apparent that increasing water problems could be solved only through an organized project. The district soon developed plans for getting water and electric power from the Merced River nearby, and in 1926 completed Exchequer Dam and powerplant.

How successful this locality built, financed, and controlled the system has been can be seen by the fact that $22,500,000 has been invested in the irrigation and power works, and that the farmers receive their water for an average of $1 per acre-foot, which means about $4 per acre per year. This is a mighty fine record when we realize that water in many neighboring areas costs from $5 to $12 an acre-foot and that the cost per acre per year runs as high as $50. I think you will agree that this group of farmers and businessmen are to be highly commended for having effectively helped themselves toward a solution of a common problem without Federal or State help.

Now the crop-raising and irrigation season in this section of California extends from about May 1 to October 15, and the problem the Merced people face is that they don't have enough storage of water at Exchequer Dam to provide a supply for the full irrigation season even in the best water years. In the poor years, like the present one, their water may run out in July. Also, when they run out of water, they run out of electric power, and the amount they can get through sale of the power is reduced because the power supply is not dependable; they probably could get a third more for each kilowatt-hour of electricity if it were firm.

There is a lot of water in the Merced River they cannot use because they can't store it and it runs away down the river, many times flooding and damaging property. The people in the district think it may be practical to build a dam at Horseshoe Bend, above Exchequer, to store a lot more water and at the same time give badly needed flood control and more dependable power generation.

There are about 50,000 people living in the Merced Irrigation District. They produce about $19 million worth of agricultural products each year. Since 1926, to the extent the project permits, they have been providing flood control on the river without Federal pay. Castle Air Force Base, one of the major facilities of the Strategic Air Command, is located within the boundaries of the district. Its pumped water comes from district sources without cost to the Government. The district provides the base with drainage facilities free of charge. A lot of taxable property was taken off the district assessment rolls when the base was located there. The people of Merced welcome the base, but it is true it is a financial burden so far as the district is concerned.

I hope your committee will agree with my view that the Federal Government has a real interest in working toward a solution of this problem and participating in an investigation of the practicality of a project the local people are willing to finance so far as their benefits will permit. And I want to assure you this means they will pay the lion's share of the cost of the project. I feel that if this study and report shows a sound project and it is built, all of you will be proud of having taken a crucial step toward a worthwhile cooperative development.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Sisk, have you taken this matter up with the Bureau of the Budget?

I know that you have discussed the matter with me personally, and that you have expressed your extreme interest in the matter, but I would like to find out the status of the Bureau of the Budget situation with regard to your project.

Mr. SISK. Where the Bureau of the Budget is concerned, I do not have an O. K. from the Bureau of the Budget for this particular request. I have talked, as I said before, to the Office of the Army Engineers, and have talked to Colonel Starbird, and as I say, they definitely recommend the project, but I do not have clearance from the Bureau of the Budget.

Now, I do not have either negative nor an affirmative decision from them. I have just not had an opportunity to get a clearance from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. EVINS. The Corps of Engineers in your district and in the Washington office both recommend the feasibility and the desirability of the project?

Mr. SISK. That is right.

I should very much like to have you check that, if it is possible, of course. If you, Mr. Chairman, or the committee would feel so inclined, you could question Colonel Starbird about it. I am sure he will so state, because they did testify to that effect.

Mr. EVINS. It is your information that $25,000 should be the minimum amount that this committee should consider to get the project underway, if appropriations are to be approved for the next fiscal year?

Mr. SISK. That is correct. They feel that to complete this study will require $100,000. There has been some question about that by some people. They feel it might be done for considerably less. However, that is the overall figure.

The indication from the Department here is that to carry them through the first year of the study it probably could be done for $20,000 or $25,000.

Mr. EVINS. The people in the area, in addition to the Corps of Engineers and their able representatives, are also in favor of this project?

Mr. SISK. Yes. I might say this is one project there is absolutely no opposition to, that I know anything about. The people are thoroughly in favor of it.

In 1950 we had a flood which ran into some millions of dollars of damage in the Merced Basin, as well as the San Joaquin River Basin, where it flows into the San Joaquin River.

In addition, today we only have about 70 percent of the water needed to adequately irrigate the 164,000 acres planned under this project. The total cost, provided this project is approved and started, for the flood control will in all probability run less than 10 percent of the cost of the project. The project will run $40 million or $50 million, and it will be financed by the local people in that Merced Irrigation District.

Mr. EVINS. One further question: Could you tell the committee how many times the Corps of Engineers has recommended the feasibility of this project?

Mr. SISK. The Corps of Engineers has not recommended the feasibility, Mr. Chairman. They have recommended that the study be made.

Mr. EVINS. I am thinking about the study.

Mr. SISK. They recommended it to us. It was recommended to my office directly, and then they went before the Public Works Committee and recommended the project, and recommended having the study.

Mr. EVINS. It was on more than one occasion; that is the point?

Mr. SISK. Well, I could not be sure of that. I know of one occasion when they did, because it was in my presence, and then to my office they have made a recommendation, which was to me. Of course, in working with the regional office in the area in California the indications by the regional office any number of times have been that it is a feasible project and that they would recommend it there.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Sisk.

Mr. JENSEN. What is the total estimated cost of the project?

Mr. SISK. The total estimated cost—and I would like to have it thoroughly understood that it is estimated, because without the Army engineers' study we do not know—today is roughly $45 million.

Mr. JENSEN. What percent of it is reimbursable?

Mr. SISK. Please do not misunderstand me. They are not asking the Government for that, because this is a local project paid for by the local people. The only thing they would be asking the Government for is the flood control features which, as I say, will be probably less than 10 percent of the total project.

Mr. JENSEN. The rest of it will be paid for by local money?

Mr. SISK. Yes. It is a project to be built by local money. The present project, Exchequer Dam, which they have there now, they paid for in its entirety, and that cost $22.5 million. The Government does not have one dime invested in either the district or the present project or the present powerplant. It will not have anything invested in the proposed project except what the Army engineers may determine to be the flood control features. This is strictly a project to be financed by the local people.

Mr. JENSEN. The reason you are asking the Army engineers to make this study and the Congress to make that part of the appropriations which are necessary and which you are requesting is that this is a navigable stream and it is a Federal responsibility to that end?

Mr. SISK. That is right. They are going in there on a stream which has features of flood control. It is a navigable stream. It is a part of the San Joaquin River Basin. And certainly the type and size of the project is such that no local group could go in on it without an O. K. from the Army engineers and without a study on the feasibility.

Mr. EVINS. It seems to me that where the local people are participating as they apparently are doing in this area, and there is a project which they will build and repay, encouragement should be given to such industry. It seems to me in situations like this the committee should give encouragement to the project.

We thank you for your statement.

Mr. SISK. I have one further statement, if you will bear with me, Mr. Chairman. My assistant just reminded me that the local people have already spent $44,000 in this study themselves. The local district has spent that much, and they have reached the point where they cannot proceed further without an O. K. by the Army engineers.

Mr. EVINS. You have made a very persuasive argument.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

EAGLE GORGE DAM, WASH.

WITNESSES

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
HON. DON MAGNUSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
HOWARD A. HANSON, CHAIRMAN, SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR EAGLE GORGE DAM, SEATTLE, WASH.
JAMES A. GIBBS, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF KING COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, SEATTLE, WASH.
HAROLD TOLLEFSON, MAYOR, CITY OF TACOMA, WASH.
CLARENCE H. CARLANDER, PRESIDENT, PORT OF SEATTLE COMMISSION, SEATTLE, WASH.
WILLIAM A. GALBRAITH, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT; CHAIRMAN, COLUMBIA BASIN COMMISSION, OLYMPIA, WASH.
BENJAMIN F. SMITH, REPRESENTING THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, KENT, WASH.
FRANK E. BRIGHTMAN, REPRESENTING THE CITY OF RENTON, WASH.
DAVE J. MOONEY, MAYOR, CITY OF KENT, WASH.
WILLIAM D. SHANNON, STATE SENATOR, SEATTLE, WASH.
DON M. FOLLETT, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SEATTLE, WASH.
STANLEY E. STRETTON, PRESIDENT, SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
BOB JONES, CITY COUNCILMAN, CITY OF SEATTLE, WASH.
GEORGE D. ZAHN, STATE SENATOR, REPRESENTING THE COLUMBIA BASIN COMMISSION
HUBERT WALTERS, REPRESENTING THE COLUMBIA BASIN COMMISSION
DEAN BARLINE, COMMISSIONER, CITY OF TACOMA, WASH., DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC UTILITIES OF THE CITY OF TACOMA, WASH.
T. W. ANDERSON, MEMBER OF THE UTILITIES BOARD, CITY OF TACOMA, WASH.
GEORGE THOMAS, REPRESENTING THE SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be pleased to hear the testimony of our colleagues, Congressman Tollefson, Congressman Pelly, and Congressman Magnuson, of the State of Washington.

I believe you have a large number of witnesses with you. We will be delighted to hear you and have your testimony.

We can say for the record that you are ably represented by your colleagues from this area.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in behalf of everyone who is here in connection with the Eagle Gorge flood-control project I want to express our appreciation for the op-

portunity of appearing before the committee and testifying in behalf of the project. We do have a large delegation.

We realize that time is limited, and for that reason all of the people here will not testify. There will only be four statements in addition to the brief comments from the Members of the House of Representatives.

I should like to ask permission of the chairman that those who do not testify be allowed to file statements.

Mr. EVINS. That permission will be granted.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Thank your, sir.

(The statements are as follows:)

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Olympia, April 22, 1955.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANNON: The construction of the proposed Eagle Gorge Dam on the Green River has become one of the most urgently needed public works in the State of Washington. For four consecutive regular sessions the Washington State Legislature has appropriated $1,500,000 for State support of this project, indicating statewide recognition of the importance of this flood-control dam.

The likelihood of a flood on the Green River, which would inundate tremendous industries and installations having to do with our national security, is very great. The construction of the proposed dam would protect these vital industries, a great volume of local industries, an important agricultural area, several towns, many State and other public facilities, plus the lives of many thousands of people.

I urgently recommend that the Congress of the United States make an appropriation to begin the immediate construction of the proposed Eagle Gorge Dam.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR B. LANGLIE, *Governor.*

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM GALBRAITH, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT, STATE OF WASHINGTON

My name is William Galbraith. I am director of the department of conservation and development of the State of Washington.

The need for construction of the proposed Eagle Gorge Dam on the Green River in Washington is so great that several people are giving testimony relative to the many worthwhile effects it will bring to the area. My testimony will be confined to the State's direct interest in this matter.

In 1949 our State legislature appropriated $1,500,000 from the general fund as the State's contribution to this important project. The law required that this could not be spent until the Congress of the United States made an appropriation for the construction of the dam. Every regular session of our State legislature since that time has reappropriated the $1,500,000—in 1951, 1953, and again in the last session in 1955.

Beside the great value of this flood-control project to industrial and agricultural lands there are other factors of great interest to the State of Washington; namely, the protection of several miles of State highways which are annually flooded by the rapid runoff of the Green River, the increased pollution control through an important agricultural and industrial area and the potential benefits to commercial and sports fishing in the State of Washington.

The Washington State Highway Department reports that every year primary State Highway No. 5 starting at about 1 mile south of Renton and extending for approximately 1 mile, is covered with 3 feet of water for about 3 days; secondary Highway No. 5B in 3 locations east of Auburn is covered every year for about 1 day to a depth of 2 feet, and secondary Highway No. 5 between Kent and Auburn is covered for 2 days to a depth of 2 feet. These floods are due to the annual normal runoff of the Green River. In years of unusually high water many more miles are inundated and for much longer periods. The construction of Eagle Gorge Dam will prevent the tremendous damage done by high water

and it will also be of great value in maintaining higher river flows during the dry periods of the year.

In this matter it will greatly enhance the fish resources of this area by making it possible to control the minimum flow of this stream. The Green River is one of the most important fishing streams in western Washington producing chinook, silver, chum, and pink salmon having an annual wholesale value commercially in excess of $600,000. In addition the Green River supports an important steelhead and resident trout fishery.

By being enabled to maintain a better flow in dry seasons the control of pollution in this important industrial and agricultural area will become far greater than it is at present.

The department of conservation and development of the State of Washington respectfully requests that an appropriation be made for the immediate construction of the proposed Eagle Gorge project.

The Columbia Basin Commission, Washington State agency, authorized by an act of the legislature, and charged with the responsibility of natural resources development, endorses the preceding statement made by William A. Galbraith, and adopts that statement as its statement in full support of the Eagle Gorge project.

The Columbia Basin Commission respectfully urges that this committee give favorable support to the requested appropriation.

STATEMENT OF BENJIMAN F. SMITH, REPRESENTING KENT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am Benjiman F. Smith, official representative of the Kent Chamber of Commerce. I wish to thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee and request permission to place the following statement and the supporting material attached hereto.

I am a resident of Kent, Wash., and a produce and dairy farmer in the Green River Valley. I am a former member of the King County Flood Control Committee and have been associated with local interests for the construction of the Eagle Gorge Dam. I represent the people of the valley, also the Chambers of Commerce of Kent and Auburn.

NATURE OF THE VALLEY

The Green River Valley which will be protected from periodic floods by construction of the Eagle Gorge Dam is a long, narrow valley about 3 miles wide and 20 miles long, embracing about 19,000 acres of fine agricultural land. The Green River is a 150-foot mountain stream which descends from the steep mountains east of Auburn and winds through the fertile valley to Elliott Bay, in Seattle, some 30 miles away. On the floor of the Green River Valley live some 35,000 people, comprising the towns and communities of Kent, Auburn, Pacific, Algona, Renton, Tuckwilla, Allentown, and Georgetown.

FLOODS

Ten major floods have occurred in the valley in the past 48 years, with smaller floods occurring intermittently. These floods are what are commonly referred to as flash floods. They are not due to a backwash from the Pacific tides. The floods occur during the months of November, December, January, and February and are attributable to the rapid runoff of mountain snow caused by the warm Chinook winds common to the region. This transformation from frozen snow to raging floodwaters takes about 64 hours. The water in its rapid descent bursts over the river banks causing the river to practically disappear and the valley becomes a flowing river. Diking and channelization, experience has shown, will never cure the Green River Valley floods. We believe from past experience and due consideration that the only remedy is the retaining basin such as the Eagle Gorge Dam proposes.

ECONOMIC LOSS

The economic life of the valley has been gradually taking shape over the past 75 years. The early days timber and lumbering provided a majority of the industry, later hop farms, then other types of agriculture and dairying became the principal types of industry. Today, industry of other types is encroaching on the valley floor. The soil is classified in land capability, class I and class II. The soils are of high agricultural value and are the most important crop-producing soils in King County. The class I and class II soils are probably

the finest agricultural lands in the United States. These soils are used primarily for the production of truck crops, pasture, forage, and intensive dairy industry. There are some farms that produce blueberries, raspberries and strawberries. The productive value of this land is exceptionally high. Nearly all of these lands are subject to flood when major floods occur on the Green River. The flooding causes severe crop damage as well as other types of damage attendant thereto. It follows that these floods require intensive work and great expense in getting the soil back into agricultural production. In the time of flood the damage to railroads, roads, buildings, and other improvements runs into many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

MATTERS OF DEFENSE TO THE AREAS

Since Pearl Harbor, the Green River Valley has become a link in our chain of national defense; to the north stands two airplane manufacturing plants, Boeing plant No. 2 and Boeing Renton. These plants produce the best fighting equipment we know of: B–47, B–52, C–97, and the new 707. To the south in the heart of the Green River Valley is located antiaircraft unit No. 28, at the O'Brien site in the Seattle defense area. These guns are installed to protect Boeings against an air attack. In time of high water this unit would be completely out of commission. I direct your attention to the certified report and sketch of the King County Soil Conservation District attached hereto.

The Army depot, at Auburn, Wash., the western terminus of the Northern Pacific Railroad is in the southern end of the Green River Valley, and is almost completely isolated from Seattle and points north in time of flood. This is a supply depot for the Seattle area, Alaska, and the North Pacific area.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS

I wish to file this statement for your consideration along with the following material: 1 certified sketch by King County Soil Conservation District; 1 collection of flood pictures; 1 statement from the Kent Chamber of Commerce.

Thank you again for you consideration.

KING COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Renton, Wash., April 11, 1955.

Mr. L. J. COSTELLO,
Route 2, Box 780, Kent, Wash.

DEAR MR. COSTELLO: Army guns located at stations A, B, C, and D would be covered by floodwaters comparable to the 1933 runoff to the depths listed: A, 3.2 feet; B, 4 feet; C, 3.2 feet; D, 3.3 feet; E, 5 feet.

O'Brien site, Seattle defense area, AAA No. 28.

That portion SE¼NW¼, sec. 1, T. 22 N., R. 4 E., lying westerly PSERY.

Yours very truly,

Floyd J. Prewitt,
FLOYD. J. PREWITT,
Engineer.
L. J. COSTELLO,
Director, King County Soil Conservation District.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 26th day of April 1955.

JAMES B. SNIDER,
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at Kent.

STATEMENT BY F. E. BRIGHTMAN FOR EAGLE GORGE DAM

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is F. E. Brightman. I am a lawyer practicing in Renton and a member of the Renton Chamber of Commerce.

Renton, located at the south end of Lake Washington between the lake and the north end of the area of Green River Valley subject to flood, is a city of about 20,000 population, the center of a residential, business, and industrial area with a population well over 50,000. Our community has a most intimate relation to this flood problem.

Immediately to the south of our city, in the north end of the flood area, is a district most adversely affected, a large part of it remains waste swampland. To the west of this swamp area, where the ground is slightly higher but still subject to disastrous floods is the Longacres Racetrack. This whole area is covered by floodwaters from time to time, sometimes for long periods of each year. Great damage has been done from time to time to the racetrack and its buildings.

It seems quite apparent that our benefits here in the Renton community will come not alone from the general benefits realized by the larger community embracing Seattle, Renton, Kent, Auburn, and Tacoma, and other valley cities and communities, but because we have immediately adjoining our city the most blighted area in the flood district, we will experience a special benefit by this flood control. If these floodwaters were controlled, this land would quickly be occupied by farms, homes, and industrial development.

The mortgage loan organizations in Seattle and the valley cities will not make mortgage loans in the worst parts of the flood area. In parts of the district where they will make them at all, the loans are so restricted because of floods that it retards or practically prevents development of a large part of the area.

We think it is apparent that if the dam were built, this valuable area, particularly that adjoining our city, would begin at once to make increased returns to the Government from its use by our people for agricultural, industrial, and residential purposes. The impetus given to the community by protection from these floods would be such as to make increased returns to the Federal Treasury, contributing substantially, we believe, to meeting the cost of the Federal outlay for building the dam.

Statement of Dave J. Mooney, Mayor, City of Kent, Wash.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee, my name is Dave J. Mooney. I am the mayor of Kent, Wash., having served in this capacity since 1947. I wish to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the people of my community for the opportunity of appearing before you with the request for construction funds for Eagle Gorge Dam.

The construction of Eagle Gorge Dam will put an end to the floods that cause losses totaling countless hundreds of thousands of dollars almost annually to the people of my community.

I have watched King County crews for over 25 years build dikes and raise roads in an effort to eliminate floods. I know there is no other plan that will give flood control to our great valley except one known to sound engineering. If there is any project that is economically justified within the purview of the Federal responsibility, I do believe it is this.

I do not wish to be repetitious, I have taken enough of your time. I am filing with your committee an exhibit, which includes photostatic copies of letters I have received from people of my community and photographs depicting various flood conditions.

Mr. Chairman, may I say for my people and myself, that we hope my appearance here will prove to be helpful.

Statement by State Senator William D. Shannon

I am William D. Shannon, a consulting hydraulic engineer of Seattle. I have been a member of the Washington State Legislature since 1947, and presently represent the 43d district in the State senate.

In 1948 the Seattle district engineer was directed to ascertain from local interests what, if any, contributions would be made to the project cost of the Eagle Gorge Dam. As a result of a conference with State, county, port, and city officials, it was decided to request the State of Washington to contribute $1,500,000 and the county of King $500,000. The county promptly made their appropriation. The proposal to request the State of Washington to appropriate its portion was presented to the State legislature by the writer and with the approval of the Governor and other State officials the appropriation was made by the legislature in 1949.

This sum was reappropriated in 1951, 1953, and 1955, and is now covered by chapter 16: Special Session Laws of 1955, approved by the Governor April 4, 1955, and is available as soon as an appropriation by the Congress is made and construction work is begun.

The State of Washington has over the years appropriated funds to deepen the Green River channel and protect its banks from erosion of the high river flows. This work, however, has little effect on the disastrous floods that have occurred frequently, overflowing the riverbanks and doing great damage to the land and structures in the valley. These floods can only be controlled by a dam constructed in the gorge of the Green River, some 35 miles above the city of Seattle. With the construction of the proposed dam, the river valley will no longer be subjected to flood conditions and the land will then be available for extensive improvements benefiting the industrial and agricultural life of a large area.

The State legislature has long recognized the importance of this problem to the economic life of King County and the city of Seattle, and earnestly hopes that the Congress will provide the necessary funds so that the Eagle Gorge Dam project may be started in 1956.

STATEMENT OF DON M. FOLLETT, VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER, SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I am Don M. Follett, vice president and general manager, Seattle Chamber of Commerce. I thank you for the privilege of this hearing.

In 1928, the chamber joined with Kent and Auburn in asking for a Federal flood-control survey of Green River. We have followed the project ever since.

In 1947, the district engineer held a hearing at which all local interests endorsed the present plan for a dam at Eagle Gorge. In 1948, the local interests were invited to indicate their views as to local participation. In 1949, the State legislature proposed a contribution of $2 million, appropriating $1,500,000 for State participation and providing for $500,000 contribution by King County. These funds have been reappropriated and are available in cash. In 1949, Congress authorized the project, conditioned upon $2 million local contribution.

The project has advanced through the planning stage and is before Congress with a budget request of $1 million to start construction in fiscal 1956. The local interests are united in support of such action.

Back in 1928, the sole problem was relief from disastrous floods. That is the primary purpose of the dam. But conditions have changed, and now the dam will serve additional purposes, all of vital concern to the welfare of the area and State.

Seattle is the largest city and the chief center of commerce, industry, and shipping in the entire Pacific Northwest. The rapidly increasing population necessitates new and modern highways. The fish resource of the Green River is increasingly important.

The summer low-water flow of the river is detrimental to fish life and a source of pollution. Private wells in the valley are polluted by floodwaters. Disastrous floods are a menace to the entire valley.

By 1928, Seattle had reclaimed from the tide and the river, and improved its principal industrial area. Today, the Government occupies one-fourth of it for defense purposes, and the rest is now in use, with rail and water transportation. The only location for expansion is in the flood valley.

What was originally the problem of the valley residents, rural and urban, has become a public problem. The dam will solve these many problems. It will also enable the city of Tacoma to increase its municipal water supply from Green River, and will permit some supplemental irrigation in the valley. In a true sense the dam is a key project.

The flood map filed at this hearing shows that there is a long, winding section of the river, from Black River Junction downstream some 4 miles, which must be improved before industrial expansion from Seattle can be had.

This work will be done at a local cost of $9,300,000, over and above further costs to put lands in the valley in condition for use. This work cannot be undertaken until the dam is assured.

The dam will remove the flood menace, the river improvement will make the valley accessible on water grade. The two will result in putting the valley in condition for its best and highest uses.

By reason of its urgent importance, and the public service it will render, the Eagle Gorge Dam is the No. 1 public flood-control project in the State of Washington.

We respectfully appeal for an appropriation of $1 million to start construction of the project in fiscal 1956.

I thank you.

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. I have just a word in connection with the project, Mr. Chairman. The committee already knows that this project has been authorized, that planning money has been appropriated, and in the next fiscal year construction work may be started, provided we get construction funds.

I think the committee has been informed that there are local funds available to the extent of $2 million which can be used as soon as Congress appropriates construction funds.

The project, as I have indicated, is for flood control, designed to prevent the recurring floods in the area which have over the years done considerable damage and interrupted the normal activities of the area.

Before I introduce those gentlemen who will testify, may I call upon Congressman Pelly and Congressman Magnuson for comments which they would like to make?

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Pelly.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very appreciative of this opportunity to join with our colleague, Mr. Tollefson, in support of the Eagle Gorge Dam. I will not take the time of the committee to go into detail, and will avail myself of the privilege already accorded to file a brief statement, which I understand will be made a part of the record.

Mr. EVINS. It may be received, Mr. Pelly.

Mr. PELLY. Thank you.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS M. PELLY (FIRST DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of construction funds for a flood-control dam at Eagle Gorge on the Green River in King County, Wash. Although this project is located in the district most ably represented by the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. Tollefson) my district has an equal interest through Seattle's need of industrial expansion into the flood area. Also I should point out that the waters of the Green River flow through the Duwamish River into Pudget Sound at Elliott Bay, which is the harbor of Seattle and a part of my district. As soon as this dam is built and the floods brought under control the channel of the lower Duwamish can be straightened out at a local cost of $9 million and a much-needed program of locating permanent bridges and highways begun. As it is Metropolitan Seattle presently is burdened by the impossibility of industrial zoning in this lower Duwamish Valley and the interest in the immediate construction of the dam of my district accordingly is very great.

Factual data is being furnished by other witnesses, and I shall not restate details which will be fully covered by others. However, in urging favorable committee action, I do want to emphasize the pressing nature of this project as far as the city of Seattle is concerned. In my opinion the estimated ratio of benefits to cost is too conservative because under present conditions the potential value of benefits has greatly increased. However, to Seattle time is the critical factor in view of the need of permanent zoning, location of highways, and other necessary improvements.

I strongly urge this appropriation, and thank the committee for allowing the various witnesses from Seattle to appear here today.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DON MAGNUSON IN SUPPORT OF APPROPRIATION REQUESTS FOR EAGLE GORGE DAM, GREEN RIVER, WASH.

The number of local witnesses scheduled to appear before this committee in support of the $1 million requested in the budget to begin construction of Eagle Gorge Dam indicates the unanimity of local backing for this project. These witnesses will supply a good deal of detailed information about the project, so I will not attempt to duplicate their testimony.

In expressing my strong support for the budget request, I just want to stress two points.

First, the Eagle Gorge Dam, which will be located on the Green River about 35 miles southeast of the city of Seattle, Wash., is absolutely necessary to control the periodic floods in the Green River Valley, which constitutes the principal—and I might say, the only—region for industrial expansion in the Seattle area. I have seen the damage which these floods can cause and can assure the committee that Eagle Gorge Dam is badly needed.

Second, there is a very high degree of local cooperation in the proposed project. Local interests have set aside $2 million in cash—$1,500,000 from the State of Washington, and $500,000 from King County—for initial construction costs of the dam. In addition, local interests are prepared to undertake the work of realining the existing river bed, building an access highway, and making other improvements which are necessary before the full benefits of the dam can be realized.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take any of the time of these witnesses, but I do want to say that I am very familiar with the need for this flood-control project. As a newspaperman in Seattle before I came to Congress I had to cover floods in this area on several occasions. In fact, I rode over all the flooded area in the Army ducks, while they were evacuating people flooded out of their homes and so forth. Therefore, I am intimately acquainted with the necessity for this project. I would like to insert a proposed statement in the record at this point.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. Tollefson, will you present the witnesses, please.

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. Yes. Before I call on those who will testify, may I read into the record the names of the people who will submit statements, to give the committee some indication of the wide support of the project.

Mr. William A. Galbraith, director, department of conservation and development, and also chairman of the Columbia Basin Commission of the State of Washington.

Mr. Benjamin F. Smith, representing the Chamber of Commerce of Kent, Washington, which is one of the cities that periodically gets flooded.

Mr. Frank E. Brightman, representing the city of Renton, Wash., which is also seriously affected by the floods which occur.

The mayor of the city of Kent, Wash., Mayor Dave J. Mooney, who is certainly familiar with the damage done from time to time.

Senator William D. Shannon, a State senator from Seattle, Wash.; Mr. Don M. Follett, executive vice president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Stanley E. Stretton, president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Bob Jones, a councilman of the city of Seattle; Senator George Zahn and Mr. Hubert Walters, two gentlemen who are members of the Columbia Basin Commission; Mr. Dean Barline, director of public utilities of the city of Tacoma; Mr. Tom Anderson, who is a member of the utilities board of the city of Tacoma.

Mr. George Thomas of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

The first witness to be heard is Mr. Howard A. Hanson, the chairman of the special committee for Eagle Gorge Dam. I might say to you gentlemen that he has been chairman of that committee, I should judge, some 20 years or so.

Mr. HANSON. It has been about that time.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. HANSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Again I wish to reiterate our appreciation for the opportunity of bringing this much-needed project to the attention of the committees in Congress. As Congressman Tollefson has said, I have served in one capacity or another for a great many years in connection with this work, and it is on the basis of a civic undertaking entirely.

The project has been before your committee through the planning period, and has weathered President Truman's directive of no new starts unless concerned with the national defense. That was the case we had to try as a case, and we won.

This project has met your committee's well-considered requirements, designed to bring up for construction the most needed projects. It has reached the construction stage and is now before Congress with a budget request for $1 million to start construction.

This has required $2 million of local contribution, which is available in cash.

As to the factual data, the cost of the project is $22.5 million, of which $20.5 million is the Government's part and $2 million the local interest.

The benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.20 to 1, and has been increasing.

In addition to the factual data that is contained in my statement, which we have copies of here for the committee, I have some supplemental data in this green folder.

I would like to file, if I may Mr. Chairman, this copy. It contains, among other things, a picture of the dam. I have here a separate sketch of the dam, which may be filed. You will then have the information there that may be helpful.

(The information is as follows:)

PROJECT DATA

LOCATION OF DAM SITE

From Kanaskat, Wash.: 6 miles southeast.
From Seattle, Wash.: 35 miles southeast.
In section 28, Twp. 21 N., R. 8 E., Willamette meridian.

HYDROLOGIC DATA

Drainage area above dam site: 144,000 acres (225 square miles)
Runoff, mean annual, above dam site: 758,000 acre-feet (63.1 inches).
(Estimated from Palmer gage 2 miles below damsite)
Discharges of record at Palmer gage (1932 through 1951):

	Cubic feet per second
Average annual	1,075
Minimum average monthly (September 1938)	99
Maximum average monthly (December 1933)	5,533
Maximum instantaneous peak (December 1946)	23,200

RESERVOIR

Reservoir length with pool at spillway crest (elevation 1,206): 5 miles.
Storage capacity with pool at spillway crest (elevation 1,206): 106,000 acre-feet.

DAM

Type of dam: Rock-fill.
Crest elevation: 1,230 feet.
Maximum height of dam above bedrock: 230 feet.
Length of crest: 500 feet.

SPILLWAY

Type of spillway: Side channel, with ungated overflow weir.
Spillway crest elevation: 1,206 feet.
Capacity: 155,000 cubic feet per second.

OUTLET WORKS

Tunnel:
Location: Left abutment.
Type: Concrete lined.
Dimensions: 22′ x 22′ (Modified horseshoe)
Length: 915 feet.
Capacity at conservation pool elevation: 1,141: 17,000 cubic feet per second.
Capacity at spillway crest elevation 1,206: 22,500 cubic feet per second.
Control: Tainter gates at intake.
Relocations:

	Length of relocation (in miles)
Northern Pacific Ry. (main line trackage)	14.8
Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co	7.0
Puget Sound Power & Light Co. transmission line	4.8
Bonneville Power Administration transmission lines:	
Line No. 1	0.8
Line No. 2	1.0
Forest Service road	2.4

Graves: 5 each (estimated).
Construction time: 4½ years.

DESCRIPTION OF DAM

Eagle Gorge dam site lies in a narrow gorge with nearly vertical rock bluffs, 180 feet high on the left side, and a somewhat less steep bank on the right. The entire left abutment appears to be composed of sound rock and similar rock is found at shallow depths in the river bed. Bedrock is exposed on the surface of a portion of the right abutment, but the major part of this abutment is a prehistoric river channel which has been filled with soil and rock brought in by river and glacial action. Because of the lack of extensive bedrock formations in the right abutment the original concrete gravity dam design has been changed to a rock-fill design.

The rock-fill, with a central, impervious core of compacted material, will rise some 230 feet about the river bed. Most of the rock-fill for the dam will come from excavation of the spillway section in the left abutment. The spillway is merely a "safety-valve" feature of the project to prevent overtopping of the dam and ordinarily water would never flow in it. Passage of water through the dam for all normally anticipated operating conditions will be accomplished by means of a 22-foot gate-controlled tunnel located in the left abutment. This tunnel will be the first item to be constructed for the dam, and during the dam construction period it will be used for diverting the river flow away from the present river channel.

Because of the nature of the soil and rock in the right abutment an impervious earth blanket will be placed on the upstream side of the abutment to prevent excessive seepage of water from a reservoir pool.

Construction of this project will introduce the problem of safeguarding the city of Tacoma's municipal water supply from pollution and turbidity resulting from construction and operation of Eagle Gorge Reservoir. The corps recognizes that the Federal Government has a responsibility for the good of the general public to preserve the existing quality of this water supply and it intends to take such measures as may be reasonably required.

RELOCATION OF FACILITIES

Construction of Eagle Gorge Reservoir will require the relocation of certain existing wire line, road, and railroad facilities. These relocations are of relatively minor extent except for the railroad. The main line of the Northern Pacific Railway follows Green River at a low level as the line approaches the Cascade Mountains. At Eagle Gorge dam site the railroad passes through the bottom of the canyon and extends eastward through the entire length of the reservoir area. It is necessary, therefore, at the dam site to raise the railroad approximately 200 feet so that the line can pass the dam and traverse the reservoir area above the maximum pool level. To accomplish this change a new railroad grade will be constructed along the south side of the valley starting at Humphrey, the eastern end of the reservoir area, and extending westward to a point beyond Kanaskat, giving a total relocation distance of 14.8 miles. Of necessity, the new location lies in steep, mountainous terrain, and the cost is estimated to be about $12 million.

Because the existing railroad passes through the site of dam construction, it is necessary that the railroad be removed before any appreciable amount of work can be done for the dam. Construction of the railroad change is therefore the first work which must be undertaken when project construction starts. Approximately 2 years will be required to complete the railroad relocation.

RESERVOIR OPERATION

The primary purpose of Eagle Gorge Reservoir is to provide a storage basin for temporarily retaining excessive flood flows of Green River. Damaging floods on Green River occur in the winter months, at any time, from about November 1 to March 1 each season. During this period the reservoir will be kept substantially empty, except for a small capacity, low-level pool to aid in river drift collection. Normal river flows will be passed through the outlet tunnel in the left abutment. If river flows should reach flood stage, the tunnel control gates will be regulated to limit releases to the safe channel capacity in downstream areas and the excess river flood flows will be impounded in the reservoir. When the storm causing the flood passes and river discharges return to normal, the impounded floodwater in the reservoir will be released through the outlet tunnel as fast as possible but always at a rate which will not exceed the safe channel capacity in the downstream areas. After a flood period has occurred, it is necessary that any floodwater impounded in the reservoir be released immediately to give storage space for another flood which might occur at any time. The cycle of impounding and releasing of floodwaters will be repeated as often as storm conditions require during each winter season.

At the end of the flood season, about March 1, the reservoir will ordinarily be empty. During the period from March 1 to about June 1 normal streamflow in excess of existing water requirements could be stored for later use during the dry, low-flow summer season. At present, it is planned to store sufficient water during this period to assure a minimum flow of 110 second-feet in the downstream river channel for the general benefit of fisheries. About 28,000 acre-feet of storage is required for this purpose. Normal spring river flows are adequate for impoundment of additional storage of about this same amount which might be used for municipal water supply, downstream irrigation, pollution control, or other beneficial water uses. Operation of Eagle Gorge Reservoir for this additional storage will depend upon the need for such storage and upon the application of public agencies for such reservoir use. If water is to be stored for these additional water supply purposes, storage charges, in accordance with appropriate Federal policy, would be assessed.

RECENT FLOODS

Severely damaging floods occur at sufficiently frequent intervals to retard further development of the Green River Valley, between Seattle and Auburn, and they also cause much damage to existing farms, homes, and many other facilities in the area. The river channel downstream from Auburn can safely carry a flow of about 12,000 second-feet, and when the river discharge exceeds this

amount, flooding of valley lands commences. In the past 10 years flood flows at Auburn have been recorded as follows:

	River discharge (second-feet)		*River discharge (second-feet)*
Dec. 11, 1946	22,000	Feb. 1, 1953	13,400
Feb. 10, 1951	18,400	Dec. 10, 1953	17,600
Jan. 23, 1953	13,300	Feb. 8, 1955	16,100

Mr. HANSON. The primary purpose of the dam, of course, is for flood control and for essential expansion into the valley.

As to the additional uses: There are benefits to fish life. That will be discussed particularly by Mr. Gibbs, and that is a very important factor. This will bring about alleviation of pollution in the lower stream.

By the way, gentlemen, in spite of the flood condition we have on that river in the summer flow it gets as low as 81 cubic feet per second. That is a menace to the fish life of that important stream.

There will also be some supplemental irrigation possible by reason of the spring storage of water.

One of the primary advantages of the storage will be to supplement and add to the present municipal water supply of the city of Tacoma, a city of about 160,000 people, which has its primary source of municipal water supply in this fine stream. The mayor of Tacoma, Mr. Tollefson, will discuss that subject, and we are heartily in accord with the position they take as to the construction and operation of the dam, so that the water supply for that municipal center shall not be damaged in any way, and that can be done.

There is no power provided for in this project by authorization of Congress. At some future time it might be possible to add to it to some extent, with a limited amount of power. But the real function of the dam is to protect against sudden floods. We have those flash floods by reason of the heavy snowfall in the mountains, combined with the chinook winds and the short distance from the upper reaches down to the valley. The floods are on us before we can turn around.

As to the critical need for the project, Seattle is the largest city and the first industrial center for commerce, manufacturing, and industry not only in the State but in the entire Pacific Northwest, the Columbia Basin, and the whole region. King County has 34 percent of the State's population. The valley has only 5 percent of the county's population.

The drainage area of this river basin is 22 percent of the total county area, so that the orderly normal development of that area becomes a matter of immediate local concern.

Green River empties into Elliott Bay in Seattle. The lower reaches of that river, commonly called the Duwamish, have been improved at local expense of between $6 million and $7 million. That is where our industrial area is located.

Having located it and started developing it, the Government now occupies one-fourth of that industrial area for national-defense uses.

Some 2 years ago we prepared this map of that industrial area [exhibiting map]. I would like to leave a copy of this with the committee. It shows the holdings which the Government has in that industrial area, and that expansion for industry in the Seattle King County area topographically is limited to the valley that is now sub-

ject to floods by reason of the moraine ridges and so forth. We have no other place to go.

This is served, as is the Seattle area, by four transcontinental railroads.

All in all, this valley is the most important in the State of Washington, to its economy. If you draw a circle with a radius of 30 miles from the flood valley you will reach more than 1 million people. Seattle reaches through on the north, and Tacoma is not far away on the south, although Tacoma is not in our immediate watershed.

Colonel Hewitt in the hearing in 1947 had before him a map which we submitted at that time, but it was not colored. This [indicating] is north, on my left. Here is Auburn [indicating]. Here is the Government Holding Depot here [indicating]; and it is just out of the flood plain that is affected by the highways which are under water, although it is clear as far as the railroads are concerned. Here is Kent [indicating]. You can see what happened to Kent in this flood. There is Renton over there [indicating]. Here [indicating] is the winding section of the river. The area covered here [indicating] was nearly 14,000 acres of land. Over here [indicating] is a narrow bottleneck section of the river. It makes 10 complete bends between the old Black River Junction and the end of the present improved waterway and the city of Seattle. To get through that section there it is absolutely essential, when the dam is built or assured, that a channel for the river be laid on the west side, that the old abandoned beds to the river be filled, and that a roadway be laid through up to about this point [indicating], furnishing access into the valley for heavy traffic purposes.

The valley there is so constricted that it is down to 1,200 feet, which includes the area for the access roads, and the different railroads to go through there. There is very little left for what you might call the industrial use, until you can get up to this upper section.

That section there is economically not feasible to construct by itself, because if it were done the whole thing would still be subject to floods. When the flood menace is removed by the construction of the dam, which is up here about 35 miles from Seattle, then this work can proceed and it will cost the local interests, according to our own official engineer estimate, $9.3 million to do that work. It has to be done.

That means that on top of the $2 million of local contribution we are putting into this development $11.3 million. On top of that, of course, there will have to be some industrial development in this section and in the Auburn and Kent sections, but that is money they have to spend for their own purposes, and they take their own chances on it.

If you added up the $22.5 million for the dam plus the $9.3 million that we are putting in, which is something over $31 million, we are putting over $11.3 million into that.

All the authorizing legislation to accomplish that result has been passed. We cannot proceed further with it until the dam is under construction. Then we can go ahead and do it. The necessities of the case compel us to do it.

So I think you can rest assured that we are not trying to hand the committee a figure which has no basis behind it.

(The statement of Mr. Hanson is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY HOWARD A. HANSON

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, thank you for the privilege of this hearing. I am Howard A. Hanson, Seattle lawyer. As a matter of civic concern, I have been interested in the control of floods in the Green River Valley, for years as chairman of the rivers and harbors committee of Seattle Chember of Commerce to 1948, and, since, as chairman of the special committee representing local interests for the project, composed of representatives of the State, King County, port of Seattle, city of Seattle, and the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

I would like to offer this map of the valley in flood; also map of the Seattle industrial area, and a folder with sketch of the proposed Eagle Gorge Dam with some supplemental data.

The project has been before your committee throughout the planning period. It has weathered President Truman's directive of no new starts unless contributing to the national defense. It has met the committee's well-considered requirements, designed to bring up for construction the most needed projects. It has reached construction stage and is before you with a budget request for $1 million to start construction. The required $2 million of local contribution is available in cash.

FACTUAL DATA

Primary purposes.—For flood control, to prevent flooding in the valley area from Auburn north, some 19,000 acres, and to enable essential expansion in the valley.

Additional purposes.—Under the project authorization, water will be stored in the spring following the winter flood season to augment low summer flows for the benefit of fish life. Reservoir space exists also to store water during the spring for release during the summer low-flow period for pollution control, irrigation, and municipal water supply. Use of the reservoir for any of these purposes is dependent upon future development of these requirements and execution of an agreement between the Federal Government and the water-using agency. The result is an ideal multiple-use project for present and future needs. My friend, the mayor of Tacoma, will discuss the relationship of the project to the water supply of his city, and, I understand, the Army engineers already have commented to the committee on this subject.

Power is not authorized. But, at some future time, limited amounts of power could be produced without interfering with the flood control or other project purposes.

Benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.20 to 1, and is growing.

Estimated costs.—Federal $20,500,000; local contribution $2 million in cash; total $22,500,000.

Planning work.—May 26, 1952, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, notified the Secretary of the Army that planning work on the project was necessary to the defense effort, and an initial allotment of $75,000 for planning and design was made on July 3, 1952. Planning and design funds by fiscal years have been allotted as follows: 1953, $216,200; 1954, $127,000; 1955, $265,000; total $608,200.

With these planning funds, project design will have reached the stage where a contract to start the railroad relocation can be awarded in September 1955 if construction funds are appropriated by Congress.

Value added by manufacture.—For the period 1947–52, census figures show that the increase in value added by manufacture in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho was 58.0 percent; and in Washington 63.6 percent.

Increase in production employees.—For the same period, census figures show that the number of production employees engaged in manufacture in the three States increased 30.2 percent; and in Washington 31.7 percent.

Population.—1954, estimated population—Washington, 2,575,000; King County, 780,000; Seattle, 550,000.

CRITICAL NEED FOR THE PROJECT

Green River empties into Elliott Bay, in Seattle. Local interests have improved the harbor, reclaimed the flats, realined the lower river, and created Seattle's industrial area on water grade with railroad and shipping service.

For defense needs the Government now occupies one fourth of this area, reclaimed without Federal aid. The rest is fully occupied. Topographically, the valley, now subject to floods, is the only available area for industrial expansion, on water grade and served by four railroads.

Seattle is the largest city and the chief center of commerce, manufacturing, and industry in the entire Pacific Northwest.

The river valley, outside of Seattle, has less than 5 percent of the county's population. Reason, flood conditions.

The county has 34 percent of the State's population, but only 3 percent of the State's land area.

Of the county's land area, 22.4 percent is in the drainage area of the river. This upper valley, now flood bound, is vitally needed in the economy of the county and State.

The dam will remove the flood menace. But, at local cost, the winding river from Black River junction downstream must be straightened, the old bed filled, and a highway built through this bottleneck section to make the upper valley accessible on water grade. Our engineers estimate this cost at $9,300,000, all exclusive of the cost of local streets, utilities, and services for industrial uses.

The two steps—removal of the flood menace and improvement in the bottleneck section—are complementary. Both are essential to the highest and best land uses in the valley. When construction of the dam project is assured, work can begin on the bottleneck section, which, by itself, is not economically feasible. In terms of critical need, both steps should have been completed by this time.

The importance and high priority of the dam stems from its critical need and multiple service. It will—

(*a*) Relieve the valley farms and cities of their heavy losses from recurring disastrous floods, as well as repair costs of the county and State;

(*b*) Make possible off-season storage for municipal and other water uses under appropriate arrangements as needs develop.

(*c*) Aid in conservation of fish life and stream pollution, through increased low-water stream flow;

(*d*) Make possible full utilization of the valley.

Self-liquidating.—Well within the 50-year assumed life of the dam there will be returned to the Federal Treasury, from operations in the upper valley, income taxes in amounts aggregating the total Federal outlay.

SUMMARY

The Eagle Gorge Dam is a key project, affecting local, State, regional, and national-defense interests. It is sound, economically justified, self-liquidating, bears a high priority rating and is critically needed.

We respectfully appeal to the Congress to initiate construction in fiscal 1956 and to complete the project as speedily as possible under sound engineering procedures.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Colonel Hanson. If I had not known you were from Washington, and if my eyes had been closed and I had not seen the map, I would have thought you were testifying for the TVA down in the area which I represent. You made a very fine statement.

Mr. HANSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. EVINS. The committee is sympathetic, I am sure, with the point of view you have expressed.

This Eagle Gorge Reservoir project was authorized in 1950. It is a $20.5 million project. To date there has been appropriated only $543,000. The budget for next year, and I assume you are testifying just for the budget request, is $1 million. You are requesting $1 million so that this project can get under way as far as construction is concerned.

Mr. HANSON. Yes, sir. I should have offered this (exhibiting document). This is the act of the last legislature. The pages are marked, showing that the legislature has put up the $1.5 million. Mr. Gibbs is here to testify that the county's $500,000 is available in cash.

Mr. EVINS. Your region is growing and blossoming forth, and you are making great progress in that area, which might be called almost an industrial Ruhr.

I did want to emphasize that this project was approved in 1950. You indicated earlier that the matter had been delayed, but that was because of the emergency of the Korean war.

Mr. HANSON. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. No project of this nature was being approved any place.

Mr. HANSON. That is correct.

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. May I call upon Mr. Gibbs, the chairman of the King County Board of Commissioners?

Mr. JENSEN. How many acres of land did you say had been flooded?

Mr. HANSON. This flood, sir, was the 1933 flood. We happen to have the actual data. It covered 13,800 acres. The valley itself is between 17,000 and 19,000 acres. I never have been able to pin down any of the engineers to the exact amount, but you could say from 17,000 to 19,000 acres would be about right.

Mr. JENSEN. How many acres will your Eagle Gorge Dam inundate permanently?

Mr. HANSON. You mean the reservoir area?

Mr. JENSEN. The reservoir.

Mr. HANSON. The reservoir area is up in the mountains.

Mr. GIBBS. It is none of this area here.

Mr. JENSEN. I know that.

Mr. HANSON. It is up in the mountains.

Mr. JENSEN. What kind of land will it inundate?

Mr. HANSON. Mountainous land.

Mr. JENSEN. Mountainous land. No agricultural land?

Mr. HANSON. No agricultural land, nor any land of any real consequence. There might be 2 or 3 little spots. There is a logging camp up there. It is most ideal from the standpoint of not damaging presently valuable property.

Mr. JENSEN. How much per acre-foot is the city of Tacoma expected to pay for this water that they are to receive from this reservoir?

Mr. HANSON. The Army engineers could answer that question. The agreement between the Army engineers and the city of Tacoma, I suppose, would depend upon the appropriations by Congress, so that they can make the contract. I do not know what they have under discussion at the moment. Are the Army engineers represented here?

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. I might say that the city of Tacoma has obtained its water from this river and it has had definite water rights over a period of about 40 years, so I do not know that the city would be required to pay anythink for the water. The water belongs to the city now.

Mr. JENSEN. But it will give them a greater supply of water, will it not?

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. No.

Mr. JENSEN. It will not?

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. I am not an engineer. The only thing that the city is concerned about is that their water supply will be depleted or polluted during construction and operation.

Mr. JENSEN. I can distinguish between Mr. Hanson's testimony and the TVA testimony. You see, the difference between this project and

the TVA project is that you are inundating no fertile land. As I understand it, the TVA project inundated permanently about two-thirds of the land that used to be inundated occasionally; so this project is quite different, Mr. Hanson.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is not entirely familiar with the situation. Most of the dams of the TVA are over in east Tennessee in the high mountains, where there are no alluvial lands. The Corps of Engineers has built some dams in the western section, but the gentleman is not correct in his statement. I am sorry that my colleague is not better informed.

Mr. JENSEN. I am not too far off, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, may I call on Mr. Gibbs.

Mr. EVINS. We would be glad to hear from you, Mr. Gibbs. We have not brought up this subject before, and probably it should not have been put on the record.

I am glad to hear the testimony of you gentlemen. I thought I heard a ring of familiarity, and that is why I mentioned it.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, my ears are not as keen as those of the chairman. I am a little older.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am James A. Gibbs, chairman of the King County Commissioners, King County, Wash. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee to reemphasize the importance of the construction of the Eagle Gorge Dam.

First, because of the great flood damage which occurs periodically: Pictures I have here will graphically show you scenes of the flooding which covered most of the lower valley of 19,000 acres—one of the most productive to be found in the West and where approximately 35,000 people live. The flood damage average loss per year is estimated at $429,000.

Pollution is always a major problem following these floods; wells become contaminated and septic tanks overflow.

The loss to the fishing industry is considerable because spawning grounds are washed out.

Green River's source is the Cascade Mountains which rise some four to five thousand feet, the winter snows are 10 to 15 feet deep. Periodically we have what is known as a Chinook wind that melts the snow rapidly. These floods are sudden and severe. Twenty-six floods have occurred in the last 52 years. Four major floods occurred in 1 year, a period of 60 days, and every few years we get a superflood. Property losses are heavy; highways and bridges are washed out and have to be repaired. The economic loss per year is heavy. As a result, these floods are a real menace.

The total expected annual economic increase will be approximately $900,000 and the State of Washington and King County have appropriated $2 million to supplement construction of Eagle Gorge Dam.

From the upper end of the present improved waterway, there is, between that point and Black River Junction, a very narrow gateway, about 4 miles long, through which the river winds and bends. Full utilization of the valley, following construction of the dam, cannot be realized until this bottleneck is alleviated. To do that it is necessary to realine the river, fill the old riverbed, and build an access highway into the upper valley from the southern environs of Seattle. Local interests are assuming the total cost of this essential work.

Under legislation passed in 1951, King County, the port of Seattle, and the city of Seattle set up a joint survey board to plan for this improvement and the development of the upper valley. A well-known New York engineering firm was engaged for that purpose. The engineers' report has been received and the plan can now proceed as soon as the dam is an assured fact. Since receipt of the report, the legislature has passed enabling legislation, under which the port of Seattle is in a position to proceed with this development program as soon as the dam is a fact.

We have always known that to put Green River Valley in condition for its ultimate destiny the elimination of floods was a prerequisite. At the same time, it is essential that this bottleneck be corrected. We are making a cash contribution to the dam project of $2 million; $1.5 million of which was voted by the State legislature, and the balance of $500,000 by our Board of King County Commissioners. We want to reemphasize that this $2 million is a cash contribution toward the cost of constructing this dam. In addition, we estimate it will cost the local interests $9.3 million to eliminate the bottleneck I have just described. Therefore, the total contribution of local interests toward the development of the valley is $11.3 million.

We respectfully submit, gentlemen, that our people are demonstrating their interest and responsibility in the contribution they are making toward the achievement of this project. We believe that the money we are prepared to spend, in addition to the Federal contribution toward the cost of constructing the dam, will prove a sound investment and return dividends through the years in increased productivity and tax returns.

We urge favorable action by the Congress and appreciate sincerely your attention to our problem.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Gibbs, for your fine statement.

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. I should like to introduce the mayor of the city of Tacoma, Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. EVINS. Mayor Tollefson, we would be glad to hear from you.

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the city of Tacoma is not located in this particular area, in this particular valley, but we receive our water from the Green River and take it some 43 miles by gravity flow from the upper reaches of the Green River to the city of Tacoma.

We appreciate fully the position of King County and the inhabitants of the area and the entire State for the flood situation as it exists. We are heartily in accord with their desire to have a flood-control measure in the Green River Valley.

However, this dam which is proposed to be constructed would be constructed some 3½ miles above the city of Tacoma's water intake. We have had that water intake there since 1910, when construction began, and we have our water rights. We applied for 100 second-feet then, and in 1933 applied for a second 100 second-feet.

This water is of an extremely potable nature. It is very good water. All that has to be done for it, so far as drinking is concerned, is to chlorinate it with a mild chlorination for the city of Tacoma. We chlorinate it at the head works. We take it some 25 to 30 miles, where we put it in a reservoir of 100 million gallons capacity, and we draw from the reservoir into the city of Tacoma. It supplies approximately 95 percent of our water.

You can see that when the construction starts on that dam we are going to have to have some measure and work out something with the Corps of Engineers for the protection of the water supply of Tacoma. During the construction there will be, of course, the necessity for building cofferdams and tunneling around and putting in the dam, and the water will be extremely muddy. We will not be able to use it. We do not have a settling basin or treatment plant. If we had to put that in it would cost us $5 million.

In order for us to be able to take care of our problem, caused by the erection of this dam, we are going to have to build some 5 to 10 years sooner than we had anticipated a second reservoir at McMillin to hold enough water so that from time to time we can fill it and release it during the course of construction. This is going to mean an extra cost to the city of Tacoma.

We appreciate that the erection of the reservoir is something we contemplated anyway in the future, but we did not contemplate it at this early date. We will be called upon to put out this money, and we will be called upon to use our wells which we have in the city of Tacoma. We have 12 wells that produce about 60 million gallons, but if there is constant pumping of those wells of course it will run the capacity down.

What we propose to do and what we hope we can work out with the engineers is a manner of construction so that they will work for 4 or 5 days while we have our dams or reservoirs full, and then when we have drawn down our reservoirs quite a bit they can let off on construction so that the water can clear up. Then when it clears up we can put it in again to fill up our reservoirs, and then they can start to work. I do not believe it would be a great problem.

There are many things that might come up, I believe, that the Corps of Engineers is advised of. We have to see that the basin is properly cleared, where this water will be stored.

The objectionable items, such as abandoned septic tanks and garbage dumps, should be stripped from the basin.

There must be adequate provision for the treatment of danger areas along the railroad. There will be a railroad line to move.

Access roads into the area should be constructed, so as to be maintained with the least disturbance to the water supply.

No general construction camp or permanent housing should be allowed on the site.

The Federal Government should acquire enough land to adequately protect the quality of the water in the reservoir, so that there will be no public access or recreation facilities. That area will attract recreation and cause a new problem.

Construction crews have to be properly watched. The area within the watershed will have to be protected against future erosion.

Then there is a problem with the dam and the outlet of the dam. At the outset it appeared they were going to have a single outlet, and we suggested that this was a very dangerous thing. If the single outlet should be clogged with snow or ice or debris or anything of that nature and we were not warned about it, we could choke off our water supply very quickly and we would not have time to adjust our lines.

We have approximately 6-foot lines running down. If you choked off the water supply quickly and we did not have an opportunity to adjust, these major lines would collapse by reason of the creation of

a vacuum. If we are given adequate notice of about 12 hours we can build up the lines to protect them.

Then comes the time when the dam is constructed. Then we have to see that the facilities for disposing of the floating and submerged debris should be provided for and the debris removed from the lake and burned on a high area, so that it will not get into the water. And there will be required maintenance of the road beds and the bridges in the proper manner. We have to take care of the brush and the weed growth along the edge of the reservoir. We want to see that that is done.

Then, of course, we have to be careful about algae growing within the water. The algae grows within the water and of course it affects the potability. The retention of vegetative elements affects the potability.

These are things which the Army Engineers recognize, and we want this committee to recognize when the appropriation is made. But all of it can be worked out so that we can still maintain our water and the dam can be erected and prevent this flood situation in the lower valley.

We anticipate that the additional cost to the city of Takoma—that is not the initial cost, but is the additional cost—is $256,000 at the outset for the cost of construction of the reservoir and its maintenance, and that an additional $27,000 will be spent in the maintenance and operation of the wells pumping out water, where we would not have to pump it if we had a normal water supply.

We respectfully request that when the appropriations are made for the construction of the Eagle Gorge Dam at the present time the sum of $283,000 be included for the first year's operation to reimburse the city of Tacoma for its cost during that period, which is the direct result of this construction.

(The statement of Mr. Harold Tollefson is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY THE WATER DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES, CITY OF TACOMA, WASH., IN REFERENCE TO THE RELATION OF THE GREEN RIVER WATER SUPPLY TO THE PROPOSED EAGLE GEORGE DAM

ECONOMIC INFLUENCE OF TACOMA

The city of Tacoma, the third largest city in the State of Washington, is located in the heart of the Puget Sound defense area. The Green River is the major source of water supply for 160,000 people and a variety of industrial, commercial, and military users in Tacoma and vicinity. The city's commercial and industrial facilities are closely integrated with the following major military and naval bases located within a 25 mile radius—the Mount Rainier Ordnance Depot, the United States Army Base at Fort Lewis and the United States Air Force Base at McChord Field adjoining the city to the south, the United States Navy shipyards at Bremerton by way of the Narrows Bridge to the north and the United States naval base in the city.

WATER RIGHTS

Tacoma's principal water supply for the last 43 years has been taken from a diversion dam on the Green River. From here the water flows west by gravity through a pipeline approximately 42 miles long to the city. The original water rights for a diversion of 100 second-feet were filed with and granted by King County in 1908 and this amount was adequate until approximately 1933 when the city of Tacoma filed for an additional 100 second-feet with the State supervisor of hydraulics, State of Washington. The city at present is diverting 113 second-feet.

PRINCIPAL AND AUXILIARY WATER SUPPLY

The gravity supply furnishes approximately 95 percent of the city's water needs, the total requirements of which are as much as 90 million gallons per day during the summer months. The gravity system is the exclusive source of water except during periods of high snowmelt or other flood conditions which cause periods of turbidity resulting from undue amounts of dirt, silt, and colloidal matter in suspension in the water. To supplement the supply during these periods and when the gravity-line capacity is not sufficient to meet peak water demands in the summer, the city has developed a series of 12 wells in the south Tacoma area. These wells have a developed capacity of 60,700,000 gallons per day, but continuous pumping of all wells will reduce their discharge.

QUALITY OF WATER NOW AVAILABLE

The development of the Green River system has proven to be both economical and desirable. The basic reason for the feasibility of this type of supply is the exceptionally high quality of the water from the Green River. This quality is such that only chlorination is needed to make it acceptable for domestic, industrial, and commercial needs. Many of our industrial firms require water of higher chemical standards than that considered necessary for human consumption. For these firms to use well water or water having lower chemical standards would require large additional investments either by the city or by these firms to bring the water up to proper standards. It should be emphasized that Tacoma has no means of water treatment except chlorination and permanent damage to this supply would necessitate the construction of treatment facilities at an estimated cost of $5 million or the development of another source.

CONTROL OF GREEN RIVER WATERSHED

Under the regulations of the State health department, the water division has exercised diligent control over the 232 square mile Green River watershed area above Tacoma's intake. Cooperative agreements with all the large landowners in the watershed area pertaining to sanitary matters and police powers have produced effective controls. The average stable population in this area is approximately one person per square mile. Summer activity due to railroad maintenance, logging camp operations, and maintenance of power and telephone lines may cause this population to double. The water division has, over a period of years, purchased considerable property in the watershed and by enforcing police measures on these lands and lands owned by others with whom the water division has contracts, it has been possible to keep the pollution at a minimum and avoid excessive costs incident to construction of treatment facilities.

LOCATION OF EAGLE GORGE DAM

The Eagle Gorge Dam, as it is presently proposed, will be located approximately 3½ miles upstream from Tacoma's diversion dam. The construction of the proposed 230-foot high flood-control dams and storage basin also requires the reconstruction of approximately 7 miles of railroad between the present intake and Humphrey. During reconstruction of the railroad and during the period of construction in the riverbed as required for the proposed dam considerable amounts of dirt and silt will be agitated and will remain in suspension in the water, making it unusable for domestic and industrial purposes. It is accordingly necessary that definite arrangements be provided to take care of Tacoma's water supply during the period that work will be going on in and along the river. Engineers of the city and the corps have made extensive studies to determine the best method of meeting this problem and it is the consensus that the most economical method would be to accelerate the construction of a 100-million gallon reservoir known as the McMillin Reservoir. This reservoir, as a part of the city's ultimate construction program, was scheduled for construction sometime in the next 5 to 10 years. By the immediate construction of the same, water could be stored in the reservoir when the river is clear and used in conjunction with the wells system during periods when the river is turbid. Under this plan controls would be placed on construction; such as, actual construction in the river would be halted periodically to allow clear water to refill the reservoir as necessary to supplement the wells system. The Army and the city have computed that the additional cost to the city for maintenance, interest, and depreciation over a period of 3 years during construction will amount to approximately $256,000.

Construction Problems of the Eagle Gorge Project

There are numerous phases of the project design which will require close attention during construction to produce the most desirable future operation conditions. Some of these requirements are as follows:

1. The clearing of the basin should be carried on in accordance with city of Tacoma watershed regulations and other pertinent legal health department requirements. Those objectionable items requiring removal such as the swamp, the abandoned septic tanks, and the garbage dumps should be stripped and taken out of the basin and any treatment of the ground should be to the satisfaction of the city. Potential slide areas should be adequately riprapped or drained to prevent their movement. Trees and stumps in the area should be completely removed. The improper removal of these materials will cause taste and odor in the water stored in the reservoir at a later date.

2. Adequate provisions for treatment of danger areas along the railroad should be included in the contract. The future maintenance of the railroad and its facilities should also be taken under consideration.

3. The access roads into the area should be constructed so they can be maintained with the least amount of disturbance to the water supply. All access roads should be gated and locked.

4. Inasmuch as the dam is located so close to the city's intake, no general construction camp or permanent housing should be allowed at the site. The presence of such a camp would materially complicate the control of the area.

5. The Federal Government should acquire enough land to adequately protect the quality of the water in the reservoir so that there will be no public access or recreational facilities developed in the area.

6. Construction crews employed in connection with the railroad relocation and dam construction should be properly controlled in such a manner as not to cause additional sanitary problems to our water supply.

7. Any borrow pits located within the watershed must be properly protected against future erosion when abandoned.

8. The details of the outlet structure which have not yet been worked out should give due consideration to provide outlets at various levels in order to eliminate insofar as possible any possibility of obstruction to the outlets which would stop the flow in the river and could cause collapse to Tacoma's pipeline, resulting in damages of hundreds of thousands of dollars. These should be designed to take care of all possible problems resulting in debris, ice, and other objectionable material.

Operation and Maintenance Problems of the Eagle Gorge Project

It should also be recognized that the manner in which the project is operated after completion is of extreme importance and improper operation could easily result in destroying the Green River as a source of supply of water for the city of Tacoma. These problems are such that they should be the subject of an agreement in perpetuity between the city and the Federal Government to insure that Tacoma will continue to receive at all times water of the same quantity and quality which it now receives from the Green River. Some of these problems are as follows:

1. It is imperative that adequate facilities for disposing of the floating and submerged debris should be provided. Debris removed from the lake should be burnt above the maximum high water mark inasmuch as ashes cause additional treatment expense.

2. The railroad should be required to maintain its roadbed and bridges in such a way as not to interfere with the potability and quality of the city's water supply.

3. The reservoir will form an attraction to the public and the use of the same as a recreational area would unquestionably result in pollution. Steps should be taken to restrict access to the reservoir, which view is supported by the Governor of the State of Washington as stated in his letter addressed to the city under date of February 25, 1954, a portion of which reads as follows:

"In order to protect the city of Tacoma's water supply it is both evident and urgent that this area be restricted against all such use as would endanger the public health and welfare. * * * Furthermore, the State has no plans for developing recreational facilities on the reservoir or in the watershed area where it would be detrimental to public health and well-being."

4. Maintenance and drainage problems of the access roads and grounds should be carried on in a way so as not to add turbidity to the river.

5. The basin should be regulated in the summer in such a manner as to have the impounded water in a constantly moving stage. This method will tend to reduce the growth of algae and weeds and minimize the erosion of the shoreline due to wave action. The lowering of the water level in the reservoir after flood conditions will cause sloughing of materials into the basin. Adequate provisions for future maintenance and protection from this source of trouble must be provided.

6. It is vitally important that cooperation between the Army engineers and the city of Tacoma exist in the operation of this flood-control reservoir. Too sharp a rise in the river flow caused by the discharge from the reservoir may result in serious damage to appurtenant structures and conversely too sharp a drop in the river flow may cause a collapse of our gravity pipeline. In either case, very costly damage could result. The city should be notified well in advance of any operation at the dam so that it can correspondingly adjust its operation.

7. It will be necessary that brush and weed growth be controlled within the reservoir and that algae which commonly grows in any reservoir also be controlled. Such growth would result in objectionable taste and odors to the water and make it nonpotable.

8. Traditional winter floods carry a high silt load which will deposit on the floor of the basin. When the water is then released, this material will be exposed to erosion by rains. If measures are not taken to minimize the effect, these deposits will have considerable influence on the turbidity of the river.

9. The geographical location of the Eagle Gorge Dam is such that needle ice and bad snow conditions are not uncommon. Inadequate supervision at the dam site might result in serious consequences to Tacoma's water supply.

SUMMARY

These facts as outlined herein should help to clarify the problems involved during the construction and operation of the project as far as they involve the city of Tacoma. The engineering department of the city of Tacoma water division will cooperate to the fullest extent of its ability to assist the Army engineers in the solution of these problems, but feel that any problems created as a result of the Eagle Gorge project are the direct responsibility of the Federal Government to correct or compensate for their correction. The city has no desire to curtail the development of the lower Duwamish, but has a real interest in the Green River and a desire to protect the present quality and quantity of water which it now enjoys. The city submits that before any construction commences, an agreement between the United States Government and the city of Tacoma be executed providing that the construction and future operation and maintenance of the Eagle Gorge project be carried on in such a manner that the potability, quality and quantity of the city's water supply will not be impaired. Said agreement shall further provide, in the event of deviation from present day standards, that the United States Government shall bear the responsibility of corrective measures. It is anticipated that the additional cost to the city for the construction of the aforementioned McMillin Reservoir will be approximately $256,000 and that the city will suffer an additional expense of approximately $27,000 during the first year of construction for costs in connection with the operation of its wells system which would not otherwise be required. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that at such time as the appropriations are made for the construction of the Eagle Gorge Dam, the sum of $283,000 be included for the first year's operation to reimburse the city of Tacoma for its costs during that period which are a direct result of this construction.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mayor Tollefson, for your statement. I might say that we in Washington, D. C., here in Congress, regardless of party line, have come to know that Thor Tollefson is the man who stands for good government. I assume he must be a relative of yours.

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. He is a pretty close relative. He was born from the same mother.

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, we have one other witness, Mr. Clarence Carlander, president of the Port of Seattle Commission.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Carlander, we would be glad to hear from you.

Mr. CARLANDER. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear here. I have my statement written out, and some of the points that I cover here were covered by Mr. Gibbs and Colonel Hanson.

The Port of Seattle Commission operates the marine terminals, airport and docks and big fishing fleet terminal, and also the cold storage plants.

Now, one thing that is a little unique about this dam is that it is built above the spawning grounds. The Green River is one of the best spawning grounds we have for salmon and steelhead. Our fishing industry is a very large one, as you know, in that area. The Port of Seattle Commission, of course, is interested in that.

So this is going to be beneficial, because when we have these flood conditions and it washes out these spawning areas of course that washes out the eggs and you lose that cycle. The same thing applies when it is too dry. This is going to be very beneficial to the fishing industry.

We have the largest hatchery in the State of Washington on the Green River.

The other point I want to emphasize is that the Port of Seattle Commission is also authorized to create industrial development districts. This is the next one [indicating on map] we are creating, right there. Of course, that is the one which is flooded most of the time.

With all of this development there, straightening the river and bringing a channel up 4 miles from where the head of navigation is here, that will all be done by local funds. Then, also, there will be expansion down this valley.

Seattle, as you know if you have been there, is surrounded by hills. Our level area is actually down in this valley for industrial development.

I think that just about covers the statement.

(The statement of Mr. Carlander is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE H. CARLANDER, PRESIDENT, PORT OF SEATTLE COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Clarence H. Carlander, president of the Port of Seattle Commission, and president of Puget Sound Freight Lines, Seattle. The port district is coterminus with King County.

1. NEED FOR FLOOD CONTROL

The Green River Valley is the most important in King County both as to agriculture and economic use. Two factors bar its best use—recurring disastrous floods and a winding river section of some 4 miles from Black River Junction north.

The dam project is economically feasible without reference to improvement of the bottleneck section of the river. By itself, the bottleneck section improvement is not economically justified. With construction started on the dam, the river section will be started.

2. FLOOD DAMAGES

In addition to recurring flood losses, and some loss of life, floods damage the fish-spawning grounds below the dam site, and bar any industrial use.

3. BENEFITS TO FISH LIFE

The dam will protect these spawning grounds from washing out in floods. Increased low-water streamflow is a definite aid to fish life. The State's largest fish hatchery is on Green River. The river is one of the best salmon and steelhead streams on Puget Sound, increasing in importance.

The port of Seattle owns and operates a large fishing vessel terminal for the Puget Sound and Alaska fleet, a large cold-storage plant and other facilities wholly for the fishing industry. The dam will be increasingly beneficial to fish life.

4. JOINT SURVEY BOARD

King County, the city of Seattle and the port of Seattle, under State law, have organized the Duwamish and Green River Joint Survey Board to plan for orderly development of the Green-Duwamish Valley, when freed of floods.

Assuming construction of the dam, the joint survey board, of which I am a member, engaged and secured from the engineering firm of Knappen-Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy of New York a definite development plan for the valley.

Enabling legislation has been enacted authorizing the port of Seattle to create industrial development districts under the plan.

5. INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

Industrial expansion into the valley depends upon the dam and improvement of the winding river section north of Black River Junction. It will cost local interest $9,300,000 to realine the river in this section to fill the old riverbed and provide an access road into the upper valley, over and above further costs to put lands in condition for industrial use.

6. PORT OF SEATTLE

The port of Seattle, on Elliott Bay in Seattle, is one of the Nation's great ports, vital in war and in peace. The Government occupies for defense uses one-fourth of Seattle's industrial area, reclaimed and improved at local cost. Federal expansion must be in the upper valley. Expansion of the port's maritime services must be along the river. The dam is the key.

This cost, plus the $2 million local contribution to the dam, in reality represents the participation of local interests to putting the flood valley in condition for use. We are ready to proceed when the dam project is assured.

The Eagle Gorge Dam serves many purposes and is critically needed. It is of such importance to the flood-ridden people of the valley, to our fast-growing population, to the State and the Northwest, that we respectfully appeal to the Congress to start construction of the dam with an appropriation of $1 million in fiscal 1956.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. EVINS. This development will not retard the growth of the salmon and steelhead?

Mr. CARLANDER. It will help it. If you want to go out fishing you will find more steelhead to catch.

Mr. EVINS. This committee would not want to do anything to hurt the fish. We have had some testimony heretofore that the building of dams retarded or delayed the salmon industry. We have had to provide funds for escalators for the fish.

Mr. CARLANDER. This is exactly the reverse of that, because this is high enough up in the mountains and the spawning streams are below.

Mr. HANSON. Also it is part of the specifications that the minimum flow of the stream is going to be increased through the operation of stored water in the dam as part of the operation. That will benefit the fish life.

The benefit to fish life incident to a spawning ground not to be disturbed is a tremendous advantage to that industry.

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, that completes our list of witnesses, and on behalf of them all again may I express our appreciation for the time you have given to us. I note that we have run over a few minutes, and we apologize for that.

Mr. JENSEN. There is one thing I would like to ask Mayor Tollefson. Do I understand that the city of Tacoma feels that they should not pay anything for this additional supply of water that this reservoir will bring about, and, to the contrary, you are asking that you be reimbursed for money you will expend because of the building of this dam?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. That is correct. The position of the city of Tacoma now is that we have our rights on the river and have had since 1910, and we have water there. We can take the water from our little diversion dam and get all the water we need.

Mr. JENSEN. You have an adequate supply of water as it is?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. We have an adequate supply of water as it is.

Mr. JENSEN. Without this dam, even with the growth of your population you could still continue to have an adequate water supply? Would it not necessitate some additional facilities?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. Like I said, we have that other reservoir we are going to build. We are going to build it in 5 or 10 years anyway, so that we can store water, but we did not anticipate building it at this time. It would cost us that much.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say, Mayor Tollefson, that it is a rather unusual situation where a city on a project of this nature does not want to pay for the water that it receives from a federally financed project. But I can understand that you possibly are in a different situation. Most cities, generally speaking, are not in this situation with regard to such a matter.

I would say that it is a little difficult for me to see where the Federal Government, which is all the taxpayers of America, should be required to pay damages, so to speak, because of the expenditure of a great sum of money which you are asking us to expend here for this project, which will be of great benefit to your area, even if it is not of benefit to the city of Tacoma itself. I may say this is the first time I have ever heard such a request.

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. It is a little different request than those you perhaps have had before. As I pointed out, the dam will do us no good we can see at the present time. It may in the future. We do not know. It may do us damage in the future because of what we will have to do with the water by reason of the storage in the dam, if it is not operated correctly.

Mr. JENSEN. Then there would be no point in your testifying in favor of this dam. Do I understand that?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. Except that I recognize the problem of the people of the immediate area.

Mr. JENSEN. I mean, so far as Tacoma is concerned.

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. So far as Tacoma is concerned itself, that is a different proposition.

Mr. JENSEN. Even from the standpoint of having a better economy in the area of Tacoma?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. I appreciate the benefit of any improved area anywhere in the United States, which is a benefit to any area in the United States, even our area. The closer the proximity of course the closer the relationship.

Mr. JENSEN. You must be a very good mayor. I can see where you are looking after your town very well. I would guess that Congress as a whole, and the Army engineers, would have to stretch their liberality considerably in order to approve an amount of money which you have asked for as damages to your city.

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. Well, I can point these things out. During that period of time we will have to use our pumping system and use the energy and pay for the energy for the pumps. That can be actually

measured. That we would not have to do during the construction if it were not for the construction. That is a $27,000 item which may vary somewhat one way or another, depending upon the amount we have to use.

Then there is the depreciation on the reservoir itself by reason of the early construction. We would not have to have it for some period of time, and hence we would wear it out that much sooner.

Then there is the maintenance and operation during that period of time.

The Army engineers have recognized that as a unique situation. I think you will observe that it is, too, when you recognize that without the dam we have no problem and we have no money to spend. With the dam we will have to spend considerably more money. We are going to have to float bonds to build our reservoir.

The Army engineers, not giving us the benefit of the doubt, say that 3 years is as far as they will go, whereas we felt it would be 5 to 10 years. Hence, on that basis this figure that we ask here at this time is a reasonable one.

Mr. JENSEN. I can see from your standpoint, Mayor Tollefson, why you were arguing the point. Maybe I am unreasonable in questioning you on this.

I do want to say in closing that I am sure you are not ashamed of your good brother Thor.

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. Not one bit.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure he is not ashamed of you. I know that Thor is doing a good job, and I can see where you must be doing an awfully good job for your city. I can understand why they elected you.

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. I would like to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

I think maybe the record ought to show, as I read and understand the testimony, that the city of Tacoma is not asking for $283,000 in addition to the $1 million already asked here. As I understand their position, they are simply supporting the justification of the Army engineers, which includes that figure for this fiscal year. In the justifications the Army engineers, if I understand them correctly, put the municipal corporation of the city of Tacoma in the same category as the railroad, which is a private corporation. The railroad tracks run down the area where the land will be inundated by the reservoir, and so the Army engineers out of this money will pay for moving the railroad tracks to a different place. In a sense, then, the Government is paying the railroad company damages for the movement of the railroad tracks.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. I would like for the record to show that under the laws of the State of Washington the city of Tacoma has defined rights to so much water, which nobody can take away from the city of Tacoma without paying just compensation. If I understand the law correctly, if in the construction of this dam that water supply is injured or taken away the Federal Government is responsible under the law. There is no question about it. The city does not ever want to get into a position where it has to go to a lawsuit, especially against the Federal Government, so this matter has been discussed over the period of time when the dam has been considered,

ever since 1947 when I first introduced the bill. The engineers are aware of it.

As I mentioned earlier, the justifications contain an item to protect the city of Tacoma's water supply. I understand from talking to the Army engineers that they have in mind pretty much exactly the procedure that will be followed to protect the city's water supply. The city of Tacoma is in a position no different from that of the railroad company, whose tracks will be moved at the Government's expense.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me say this: If Uncle Sam has a contract and an agreement with the city of Tacoma that is ironclad as I understand it is by your testimony, Congressman, then I will be the first man to insist and demand that Uncle Sam keep his word.

Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. What I said was not for the gentleman's benefit, but for the record.

Mr. JENSEN. All right.

Mr. HAND. Mayor, the water department of Tacoma is entirely a municipal operation?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. Yes.

Mr. HAND. You sell water to the water users of the city?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. To the water users of the city.

Mr. HAND. What is your approximate use of water in millions of gallons per day?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. It fluctuates during the year. It goes up to approximately 90 million gallons a day.

Mr. HAND. That would be the maximum?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. That is during the summer months. The mean use, I would say, is around 65 million to 70 million gallons.

Mr. HAND. Are you able to tell me what your water revenues are, and the profits from your water department?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. I do not believe I can tell you offhand. Mr. Barline, do you know that?

Mr. BARLINE. $200,000 last year.

Mr. HAND. Was that net?

Mr. BARLINE. Net before paying off the bonds. We had bonds that had to be paid off in the amount of $380,000 last year. We had $200,000 net.

Mr. HAND. Except for amortizing the bonds you made a net profit of approximately $200,000 per year from the sale of municipal water; is that right?

Mr. BARLINE. That is right, which is all used to go back into capital outlay.

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. We cannot make a profit and use it except for water. Any profit that comes up, we have to cut the rates.

Mr. HAND. Under what provision of law? Is that in a charter, or what is that?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. That is our own. We are not in the business for profit. We cannot use the money we derive except for the water business. We cannot transfer it to any other funds, under State law.

Mr. HAND. State law?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mr. HAND. That was my question. What is your annual budget, mayor?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. For the entire city?

Mr. HAND. Yes.

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. There are the utilities and general government, which run around $26 million.

Mr. HAND. How much do you charge for water? Is your water system metered?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. Yes.

Mr. HAND. How much do you charge?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. Mr. Barline, will you answer that?

Mr. BARLINE. 13 cents for the first 100 cubic feet, and then it drops down to 8 cents for 100 cubic feet.

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. If I may augment a statement here, recognizing that it is the duty of the Federal Government, we believe, to maintain our water, we went to the Army engineers and said, "Let us work out our plan together." I think this is the best way to do it. This is the cheapest way for the Army, and will be best for the long-range planning of the city, anyway. But it is in addition to what we would otherwise have done. It comes 5 or 10 years sooner than we would have had to do it. And the Army says, "We will give you approximately 3 years."

Mr. HAND. How much depreciation did you calculate on the reservoir in arriving at the figures?

Mr. BARLINE. The Army Corps of Engineers used those figures in arriving at it. I believe they used 1.6 percent. It is a 70-year life, approximately.

Mr. HAND. A 70-year life. Thank you.

Mr. MURRAY. I noticed in your statement for the record that you made one statement which had me confused. I do recognize the obligation of the Federal Government to pay compensation where it destroys the property of another. But in your statement I believe you said that the present water rights are adequate to supply your water demands, and I noticed in your prepared statement that you have original water rights for a diversion of 100 second-feet, and then you applied in 1933 for an additional 100 second-feet, and you are now diverting 113 second-feet.

Is your contract with the State or agreement with the State something to give you a firm right to divert 113 second-feet, and is that adequate; or would you care to comment?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. We get 113 second-feet. We do not use it all, but that is the capacity of our line flow. We want to keep that line flow to capacity for the reason of preventing vibration and vacuum and so forth. We run it down to our reservoir, which is approximately 25 miles away. Then when the reservoir is full and we can no longer use it in the reservoir we divert it into the Puyallup River, an adjoining river some 25 miles away. We store our water and let the water just keep on coming, because that is the capacity of the line.

Mr. MURRAY. What are your present diversionary rights? Are they adequate to maintain your line at its desired capacity?

Mr. HAROLD TOLLEFSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVINS. I judge that all the Representatives and all the citizens here represented at this meeting favor the $1 million budget recommendation for advancement of this project? There is no opposition, I assume?

Mr. HANSON. That is correct.
Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON. I have heard of none, sir.
Mr. EVINS. We thank you all for your statements.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

SUCCESS DAM, CALIF.

WITNESS

ROLAND R. KILLIAN, RANCHER, SPRINGVILLE, CALIF., APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE PORTERVILLE GRANGE, SPRINGVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SOUTH TULE INDEPENDENT DITCH CO., SPRINGVILLE CENTER OF THE TULARE COUNTY FARM BUREAU, TULE RIVER SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT, AND COMMITTEE AGAINST SUCCESS DAM

Mr. EVINS. We would be glad to hear from Mr. Roland R. Killian.

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir. I am here speaking in opposition to Success Dam.

I am R. R. Killian, a rancher from Springville, Calif. I represent the following organizations which oppose the construction of Success Dam and present a letter from each one designating me as their spokesman before this committee, as well as a copy of each organization's resolution: Porterville Grange; Springville Chamber of Commerce; South Tule Independent Ditch Co.; Springville Center of the Tulare County Farm Bureau; Tule River Soil Conservation District; Committee Against Success Dam. I also present a resolution from the Poplar Irrigation Co.

The Committee Against Success Dam has a petition with a list of petitioners with 640 signatures, and 76.6 percent of those are located below the dam site.

I wish to emphasize that the opposition is strongly represented by ditch companies and individuals residing below the proposed dam site.

In addition to the tangible evidence of opposition, I can state that the Porterville Chamber of Commerce and the directors of the Tulare County Farm Bureau refused to reaffirm resolutions previously adopted favoring Success Dam. Other ditch company directorates were divided in their feeling toward the dam and failed to adopt resolutions for or against. I go into this detail to demonstrate that the opposition is not just the traditional dissidents whose lands might be condemned in order to build the project.

We specifically request that your committee reject the item of some $100,000 for further planning which is included in the budget of the Corps of Engineers. We further request that any sum which might be requested for construction be rejected.

Since the authorization of Success Dam by the Congress in 1944, $400,000 has been expended for planning. The dam is proposed to provide protection to Porterville and the farmlands in the delta from damaging floods from the Tule River. The project flood accepted by the engineers is 34,000 cubic feet per second. They also estimated that a flow of 16,000 cubic feet per second would flood Porterville. A flow of 32,600 cubic feet per second was recorded during the greatest

flood of record in 1950, but no flooding occurred in Porterville. Farmlands which had been reclaimed from sloughs and by constricting the channel of the Tule River, experienced washing. Aside from some late unharvested cotton, the damage to the rural areas was largely superficial and damage estimates depended largely upon the individual mood of the tenant. In areas where floods are of more frequent occurrence and deal much real damage, the type of flooding experienced in the rural areas would be generally classified as nondamaging.

In October 1954, Colonel Ely, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, stated in a public meeting that the proposed dam would afford no protection against the 100-year flood, or floods materially greater than the project flood. The dam was not needed for the record flood of 1950, and its construction would give residents a false sense of security in the event of a greater flow. The construction of the dam would encourage building and development in locations which would be dangerous.

The construction of Success Dam has been most actively promoted by persons and organizations who are located many miles to the west of the dam site. Their interest is, and always has been, in the irrigation benefits which might be derived from its construction. The Tule River Delta is a water-shortage area where the available water is put to efficient use. No runoff from the river ever reaches the ocean and only about once in 7 years does any of the flow ever reach the reclaimed area known as the Tulare Lake Basin. The percolation rate in the fan is very high despite the filling of sloughs and the constriction of the channel, and the winter and spring runoff goes underground quickly to provide a reserve of water for the growing season which keeps evaporation losses at an ideal minimum.

The Friant-Kern Canal passes about 3 miles west of Porterville. In the irrigation districts serviced by the canal, the water pumped from underground reserve provides about 50 percent of the water requirements. In the extensive farming areas which do not receive the imported water furnished by the canal, in excess of 80 percent of the water used to maintain agriculture and for domestic use, is pumped. In spite of the importation of supplementary water, the water level in the entire fan is steadily dropping. Under the conditions prevailing in the area, no irrigation project can possibly be justified unless it can show a net increase in the available water supply locally. The project report claims a net saving of 10,000 acre-feet per year. This claim is based on the allegation that the evaporation losses of water impounded behind the proposed dam will be less than the losses through evaporation in the Tulare Lake Basin. Records show that water from the Tule River reaches the lake about 1 in 7 years.

A study of the San Joaquin-Sacramento Water Supervision Report for 1952, which was a year of extremely high runoff, shows that the flow of the Tule River at the proposed dam site was 287,803 acre-feet. Additional waters of unknown volume from the Kaweah watershed are discharged into the Tule River before it enters Tulare Lake. The inflow at that point was 104,775 acre-feet and represents not Tule River water alone, but additions from the Kaweah River. The Tulare Lake Basin received a total of 589,385 acre-feet from the Kern, Tule, Kaweah, and Kings Rivers. In 1953, 1 year after this inundation, all but 2 sections of land were ready for cultivation. The evaporation

losses instead of being spread over a period of several years, were confined to 1 year only. In order to sustain the claim of a net saving of 10,000 acre-feet of water through the construction of the dam, the entire inflow of water to the lake through the Tule River Channel would have to be credited to the Tule River alone, and it would have to be assumed that 70 percent of this amount evaporated in 1 year.

Should the dam ever be built, the claimants for the unappropriated waters would be able to take possession of their share through canals and conduits. Many thousands of acre-feet might be transported to remote areas and the percolation rate in the fan would be drastically decreased. The water level below the dam site would drop away more rapidly and the agriculture of the area could be permanently crippled. The dam, by providing no new water, would only provide the means for a redistribution of the present supply. None could benefit without taking water from someone else.

There is no provision made to provide for the present and future needs in flood control or in irrigation for the extensive farm area above the proposed dam side. Success Dam would close the door to any development of the area's present and future recreational needs without costly duplication.

An investigation of the application of Public Law 566, that is the small watershed plan, is being inaugurated with the objective of providing what flood control might be indicated, along with recreational and local irrigation planning. Should this plan be feasible, the present water distribution from the Tule River could never be radically changed. Watershed management practices prevailing on private lands are adding substantial amounts of available water through the eradication of brush and weed trees. Through the local soil-conservation district, it is hoped that lands under Federal jurisdiction can be included in this type of improvement.

It is difficult to see how Success Dam can be justified on the grounds of overwhelming or even general public benefit. On the contrary, the entire water supply, already deficient, will be thrown out of balance. The deficiency condition of even the successful claimants to the unappropriated water will only be alleviated, not corrected. Only the importation of water from northern California which will cost hundreds of millions of dollars will correct the water-shortage situation. Funds appropriated for Success Dam will cause grave damage to many people and will solve no problem in the process.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Killian. I am sure that this committee only wants to do the right thing and the proper thing. There are others who are advocating this project on the basis of flood control, the prevention of great flood damage. What is the situation with respect to floods in the area, in your view?

Mr. KILLIAN. I have a resolution here from one of the lower districts which has gone on record against it. This is the Poplar Irrigation Co., which is right below the dam, which is heavily flooded. It says:

Whereas the records show, that recurrence of damaging floods is once in 6 years, and

Whereas some flooded areas are benefited, which offsets the damage.

We, the Board of Directors of the Poplar Irrigation Co., believe that the damages from floods would not justify the expenditure of funds to construct and maintain the Success Dam.

We believe that several small dams higher up on the river and its tributaries would control the floods and could be constructed for 25 percent of the cost of the Success Dam: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Poplar Irrigation Co. do oppose the appropriation of any funds to construct the Success Dam at this time; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Senate and House committees in Washington, D. C.

It is certified.

Mr. EVINS. A copy of that may be added to the record.

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes.

(The information is as follows:)

The Poplar Irrigation Co. is a mutual water company, which was organized and has been operating and diverting water from Tule River continuously since 1891.

Whereas, the records show, that recurrence of damaging floods is once in 6 years, and

Whereas, some flooded areas are benefited, which offset the damage. We the Board of Directors of the Poplar Irrigation Co. believe that the damages from floods would not justify the expenditure of funds to construct and maintain the Success Dam.

We believe that several small dams higher up on the river and its tributaries would control the floods and could be constructed for 25 percent of the cost of the Success Dam. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Poplar Irrigation Co. do oppose the appropriation of any funds to construct the Success Dam at this time; Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Senate and House Committees in Washington, D. C.

I certify that the foregoing resolution was duly passed at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Poplar Irrigation Co. held on the 4th of April 1955.

[SEAL] IRA ANTHONY, *Secretary.*

Mr. EVINS. Where are the people in opposition located? Is that below the dam or above the dam?

Mr. KILLIAN. Below the dam.

Mr. EVINS. How far below?

Mr. KILLIAN. They are below the dam about 5 miles.

Mr. EVINS. But they do recognize that there is some flood damage, because they advocate the building of other dams in the area.

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, there is some flood damage, but they oppose it because they realize that by constructing this dam water can be exported out of the area to their detriment or to their damage.

Mr. EVINS. The principal objection is not the flood situation; it is the fear of loss of water?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir; it is. That is the essence of the entire objection to this thing.

Mr. EVINS. Are most of the opponents to this Success Dam project below the dam or above the dam? Where does the opposition largely center?

Mr. KILLIAN. Here is a petition opposing Success Dam, by the committee opposing it. There are a total of 640 signatures, and 76.6 percent of those are below the dam.

Mr. EVINS. You may file that for the committee, if you wish.

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir.

(The information was filed with the committee.)

Mr. KILLIAN. I also have the resolution of the Porterville Grange.

(The information is as follows:)

PORTERVILLE, CALIF., *March 18, 1951.*

R. R. Killian is hereby named to represent Porterville Grange No. 718, Patrons of Husbandry, at hearings of the Civil Functions Appropriations Subcommittees,

and to oppose appropriation of any funds for the proposed Success Dam project, on Tule River, Tulare County, Calif.

SANDER W. TEMPLETON,
Master, Porterville Grange.

RESOLUTION

Adopted by Porterville Grange No. 718, Patrons of Husbandry.

Porterville Grange, the membership of which includes landowners and farmers of the entire Tule River Valley, opposes construction of Success Dam for the following reasons:

Necessity for expenditure of huge sums on flood control works on Tule River, which gets out of its banks only once in 17 to 20 years, has never been proved.

Allegation that the river ever has, or ever will, do flood damage to the valley averaging $225 per year is unsupported by facts or history. The city of Porterville has never been flooded by the river.

Tulare Lake Basin conservation and irrigation districts have filed legal claim to all water stored behind the dam, which contradicts assertions of the United States Army Engineers, that Tule River does extensive damage in the lake basin during years of heavy runoff.

Success Dam would sever every road leading from Porterville to the foothill and mountain areas to the east of the city.

Smaller, upstream dams would provide better flood control, at much less cost, would protect 20 miles of the Tule Valley that Success Dam would not, and would in addition provide recreation and fishing in the mountains.

For these, and other reasons, Porterville Grange opposes construction of Success Dam, and asks Congress not to appropriate any further sums for studies or work on the project.

Mr. EVINS. They are below the dam?

Mr. KILLIAN. All below the dam.

Then I have others located above the dam site. The opposition to this project below the dam site is not inconsiderable. It is widespread.

There are other ditch companies that have acted in this matter. They were asked to get a resolution favoring it.

Mr. EVINS. Do the ditch companies fear that the Government may divert water to use and may not employ it properly?

Mr. KILLIAN. Not the Government. They are afraid of the State. You see, the department of finance of the State of California filed on 75,000 acre-feet of unappropriated water. That is the amount that could be retained behind the structure. I can list some of the filings.

Mr. EVINS. As I understand it, the Corps of Engineers surveyed this on several different occasions, and they have recommended it to the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress as a desirable flood control project?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVINS. You are here opposing the development of the dam in the area because of the fear of loss of water, and for other reasons.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Killian, is the terrain in this valley where this Success Dam is proposed to be built rolling land, or is it farmland, generally speaking?

Mr. KILLIAN. Do you mean above or below the dam site?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, let us take it above the dam site first.

Mr. KILLIAN. Above the dam site, it becomes foothills, and then it goes immediately up to 10,000 feet elevation.

Mr. JENSEN. The foothills could be farmed up to a certain elevation?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir; up to about 2,000 feet, but I would say anything over that could be applied to orchards, for the growing of apples and pears.

Mr. JENSEN. For that land which is tilled, soil conservation is flood prevention, so to speak.

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. Soil conservation is actually the finest and the best way and the most effective way to prevent floods from occurring on the main stem.

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. However, there is a certain amount of this watershed above the dam which is mountainous, where soil conservation cannot be put into effect, and that part, of course, is the part of your watershed which creates the floods, I presume?

Mr. KILLIAN. That is a part of it; yes, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. It is above the dam a considerable distance, where the farmers want more water for irrigation; is that right?

Mr. KILLIAN. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. They are for this project because they will be put in a position after the dam is built, if it is built, to get more water with which to irrigate their lands.

Mr. KILLIAN. They will not get any more water. They might be able to get more water individually, but it will be at the expense of someone else who, at the present time, is pumping.

Mr. JENSEN. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. The people below the dam are fearful that the amount of water which they now receive for irrigation purposes and also for industrial and commercial purposes will be reduced in quantity if this dam is built?

Mr. KILLIAN. They are afraid that it will be transported out of the area. They are afraid that the water will be piped from the dam site to a more remote area, and that the percolation rate in the delta would be reduced, and therefore the water table would be reduced.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there not an awful lot of water during your melting season in the mountains which runs past you in this stream where this district is supposed to be built, and which goes to waste?

Mr. KILLIAN. It never reaches the ocean.

Mr. JENSEN. It never reaches the ocean?

Mr. KILLIAN. No, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. You mean, it is all utilized in some way?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir; it is pumped. They have wells as deep as 1,500 feet to pump that water.

Mr. JENSEN. How far is it from the ocean?

Mr. KILLIAN. We are a good 150 miles from the ocean, with the coast range in between us.

Mr. JENSEN. You say none of the water which goes down that stream even in May or June, when the snow is melting from the mountains, goes to waste, and it is all used for some purpose?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir; in 1952, when the lake basin was filling up, there was some pumping over into the Kings River, which drains into the ocean, but the Corps of Engineers put a stop to that. They told them to keep it down where they could use it.

Mr. JENSEN. You have a case where people below the dam from the proposed dam site to the ocean, are fearful that by the building of this reservoir, which will be built back of Success Dam, will take water away from them which is needed by the farmers and the cities and the municipalities?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. It is a rather unusual situation that all of that water could be used which would come from the mountains during the melting season of an area that great.

I am not saying that it is not true, however.

Mr. KILLIAN. It is a very unique situation.

Mr. JENSEN. It must be.

Mr. KILLIAN. The Corps of Engineers, I think, will concur in everything which I have said.

Mr. JENSEN. The floods have caused little damage, comparatively speaking, over a period of years?

Mr. KILLIAN. That is correct, and that is the opinion of most of the old residents, and people who live along the river.

Mr. JENSEN. Is the river leveed?

Mr. KILLIAN. They have levees along it, but they have so constricted the channel that there is practically no channel left any more. They have filled in all of the sloughs. The river used to fan over the area, and go underground, but now they have leveled off those sloughs. They have one channel, but that is constricted to the point where it has no capacity at all, and whenever there is high water, they have people who suffer damage in these slough areas.

What they are doing is farming in a former riverbed, and naturally, the people who suffer that type of damage are certainly in the minority. They want to have some sort of protection, but they like to be close to the river because the water table is more quickly restored, after each winter runoff. Their land is more valuable for that reason.

Mr. JENSEN. Just where do you live?

Mr. KILLIAN. I live about 12 miles above the dam site. I am up in the mountains.

Mr. JENSEN. You live above the dam site?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. You would be in a position to derive benefits.

You would be personally in a position to derive benefits from the building of the dam, if there were to be upstream benefits?

Mr. KILLIAN. I think not, sir. If they get this reservoir dam, they would have to put a very costly road around there, and it would detour us about 5 miles through some very hilly terrain, and that would be a nuisance, as far as we are concerned.

I do not see in what way I would benefit from it, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. Would you be in the area which would be inundated by the flooding of the dam?

Mr. KILLIAN. Every year I count on replacing some fences down along the river line.

Mr. JENSEN. The building of this dam would not inundate any of your land?

Mr. KILLIAN. No, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you irrigate?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. You take your water now out of the stream?

Mr. KILLIAN. Away up above; yes, sir.

I have the oldest ditch right on the river.

Mr. JENSEN. You get plenty of water now?

Mr. KILLIAN. No, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. However, you are not complaining?

Mr. KILLIAN. I am not complaining, because that has always been the condition.

Mr. JENSEN. Do your neighbors feel as you do about this matter?

Mr. KILLIAN. They are unanimous in that, in the entire area.

Mr. JENSEN. Even above the dam?

Mr. KILLIAN. They are opposed to it.

Mr. JENSEN. How far above the dam does this group live, who are in favor of this project?

Mr. KILLIAN. The ones in favor of it are not above the dam, sir. They are in scattered areas, and such areas down below, and specifically they are the Tulare Lake Basin people, and the big land companies down there, which is perpetually a water-short area, and there are also some irrigation companies below the Friant-Kern Canal.

Mr. JENSEN. The people who are in favor of this are scattered in small areas?

Mr. KILLIAN. I would say that they are scattered in small areas below the dam site. They are incorporated within certain irrigation districts, and they are also composed of land companies, and the big farming operations down in the Tulare Lake Basin.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, I must say it is a unique situation.

Mr. EVINS. It is revealing to me as a unique situation also. Most generally, people are advocating the building of dams for the conservation of water, and it is stated in the testimony many times that if you build a dam, we will save this water and conserve it for irrigation purposes, and for use for agriculture.

They state that the lack of a dam causes flood damage, and the water wastes away, and they advocate the building of a dam to conserve water, but you state that if you do not build the dam you will conserve water.

Mr. KILLIAN. The water goes underground, sir, but in the case of an extreme runoff, it goes into the Tulare Lake Basin, where almost 500,000 acre-feet was used 1 year down there.

However, in normal years it all goes underground where it can be pumped, and it restores the water table down below. None of it goes to the ocean, and that is why it is unique, and that is why it bears no semblance to a situation where your surplus water finds its way to the ocean.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Killian, you may have the privilege of extending your remarks, and adding additional statements for the record, if you desire, or any other documents or statements which you want, may be included.

Mr. KILLIAN. Thank you, sir. I would like to have inserted into the record the resolution and statement of the Springville Chamber of Commerce, as well as the statement by the Committee Against Success Dam, and I think you have the petitions which cover that; the letter from the Tule River Soil Conservation District; the letter from the Springville Farm Bureau Center; a reprint from one of the local papers, the Porterville Recorder; the resolution from the Springville Center, Tulare County Farm Bureau, and the letter from tht Tule River Soil Conservation District Board of Directors.

(The matters referred to follow:)

SPRINGVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Springville, Calif, April 29, 1955.

To Whom It May Concern:

Mr. Roland R. Killian is hereby designated and authorized to appear before your committee in opposition to further appropriations for the proposed Success Dam.

DOROTHY DYE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

RESOLUTION OPPOSING FURTHER APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUCCESS DAM

Whereas the proposed Success Dam will not solve the flood problem of the town of Springville and the surrounding areas above the proposed dam site; and

Whereas relocation of State Highway 190 and the Frazier Valley-Strathmore Highway will be an added burden to all taxpayers in the watershed above the proposed Success Dam by isolating the area; and

Whereas the impounding of water at that low level will be of no benefit what so ever to the ranchers, farmers, businessmen, and sportsmen in the 250,000 acres of watershed above the proposed dam; and

Whereas $400,000 has already been expended for Success Dam engineering studies and an additional $100,000 is requested by the Corps of Army Engineers for further studies; and

Whereas the Tule River Soil Conservation District Directors are formulating an over all watershed survey: Therefore; be it

Resolved, That the Springville Chamber of Commerce opposes any aprpopriation of any type for Success Dam until the possibilities of upstream dams as provided by Public Law 556 is fully exhausted.

Unanimously passed by the Directors of the Springville Chamber of Commerce, March 1, 1955

DOROTHY DYE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

PORTERVILLE, *April 14, 1955.*

R. R. Killian is hereby authorized to represent the Committee Against Success Dam before congressional committees hearing requests for appropriations for surveys or construction of Success Dam and reservoir.

M. R. KINCAID,
President, Committee Against Success Dam.

PORTERVILLE, *April 14, 1955.*

The Committee Against Success Dam calls the attention of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with the Success project to the following facts:

The allegation that Tule River has, or ever will, do average annual flood damage amounting to $225,000 is fantastic, supported by neither fact nor history. Such a figure, given at a recent public meeting here, by the United States Army engineers, drew derisive hoots from the audience. The river gets out of its banks, on the average, once in 17 years. Then the floodwaters do as much good as harm. Farmlands joining the river, and most subject to overflow, are the highest priced lands in the valley, despite this alleged flood menace simply because the availability and cheapness of water, close to the river, far outweigh the occasional damage by overflow.

Irrigation benefits, as figured by the United States Army engineers, are so nebulous and uncertain that irrigators here have refused to underwrite the alleged benefit figures. The engineers are now engaged in rewriting the flood and irrigation estimates, with the probable intention of reducing the irrigation benefits so as to make the project more acceptable.

Tule River gets out of its banks west of Porterville occasionally, largely because the channel is constantly being encroached upon and constricted by the landowners through whose property the stream runs. These same landowners, who have reduced the main distributive channel's capacity to a fraction of its former amount, and who have filled in dozens of smaller distributive channels, are the most ardent supporters of Success Dam. Successful operation of Success Dam and Reservoir, in flood control, requires the reopening of the old distributive channels to the point where they can handle four times their present capacity, the Army engineers stated at a recent public meeting here. The engineers suggested that a State law prohibiting the filling in of such distributive channels of

all streams, is highly necessary. Reopening the old channels would end the flood menace and would cost only a fraction of the amount required for Success Dam.

Success Dam was authorized in 1944 on the estimate by the United States Army engineers that it could be constructed for $7,400,000. Estimated construction cost now is $13,400,000. The Committee Against Success Dam believes the 1944 estimate was purposely cut to a comparatively low figure, to bamboozle Congress into supporting a project that would not have been supported had its true cost been given at that time. This is strictly in line with policies of the Army engineers for 175 years.

The United States Army engineers retain in their flood-damage estimates huge sums alleged to represent damage to the Tulare Lake basin by Tule River overflows. At the same time, the Tulare Lake basin irrigation and conservation districts have filed legal claim to all the water impounded by Success Dam. They want the overflow to irrigate the rich lake basin farmlands; the engineers continue to claim that the waters the lake districts are trying so hard to get will damage the lake districts to the extent of millions of dollars. Both can hardly be right.

In February 1955, by a 4-to-1 vote, a soil and water conservation district was organized, to embrace the entire Tule River Watershed upstream from the Success Dam site. Surveys and estimates are now being sought, under the recently adopted Watershed Protection Act, for a number of flood control and irrigation projects, involving reservoirs with storage capacity up to 5,000 acre-feet. There are already in the protection district bounds some 200 small storage reservoirs and, with the support given by the Watershed Protection Act, several hundred more may be constructed, so that within a few years flood-control reservoirs with a far greater aggregate capacity than the proposed Success Dam, may be built on the upper reaches of Tule River. At least, this district is entitled to a few years time to develop the possibilities of this upstream storage. These scores of small dams will more successfully control Tule River than would Success Dam, and at a fraction of the cost of Success.

Construction of Success Dam would cut every present route between Porterville and the foothill and mountain area east of Porterville, and would almost completely isolate the rich Success Valley fruit-growing and farming area.

Dams such as Success, placed directly across the river channel, have a useful life of 35 to 50 years. By the time the alleged irrigation benefits of the Success project are paid off, the reservoir will have been filled with silt to a point where it can no longer be used for water storage.

On these, and other grounds, the Committee Against Success Dam asks the Congress to appropriate no further sums, for more so-called surveys, or for construction, for this totally unnecessary project.

M. R. KINCAID,
President, Committee Against Success Dam.

TULE RIVER SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Springville, Calif., April 27, 1955.

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter will introduce Mr. Rolland R. Killian, president of the board of directors of the Tule River Soil Conservation District.

By a unanimous vote on this 27th day of April 1955, the board of directors of the Tule River Soil Conservation District designated Mr. Killian to serve as their bona fide representative to express their official opinions and views in respect to the Success Dam project and its effect upon the Tule River watershed.

By direction of the board of directors of the Tule River Soil Conservation District.

HUGH T. GORDON, *Secretary.*

PORTERVILLE, CALIF., *April 29, 1955.*

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Springville Farm Bureau Center has gone on record as unanimously opposing the construction of the Success Dam on the Tule River. The tremendous expenditure necessary for its construction is out of all proportion to the flood damage that has ever been caused by this stream.

Mr. Rolland R. Killian is hereby authorized to represent this group in the presentation of this matter before your committee.

Very truly yours,

SPRINGVILLE FARM BUREAU CENTER,
RALPH W. GOULD, *Chairman.*

[Editorial Reprint from Porterville Recorder, December 14, 1952]

BUILD SUCCESS DAM AND PROJECT, SOUTHEASTERN TULARE COUNTY

Success Dam, on Tule River, should be built now. Porterville needs it as a protection against flood damage and the surrounding trade area needs it also. Congressman Werdel should do all he can to get an appropriation and we believe he will.

The United States Army Engineers, who make surveys in different parts of California and the United States, have decided that a flood control and irrigation dam is necessary here on Tule River and their decision is enough. Apart from this, we have the opinion of our own good and capable engineer, Irvin Althouse, who knows the situation and knows that the dam is a necessity. Nothing but the dam will guarantee Porterville against future floods that might bring disaster. Floods have caused damages in parts of Porterville and in different districts nearby in years past, and have damaged many acres of farmland.

This editorial is written in answer to questions from different ones who have considered this a matter for the people to decide at the ballot box. This is not the case. It is not a question of voting for or against the Tule River-Success Dam at an election. It is a protection which the United States Government gives to different communities for future irrigation and flood control. The engineers decide it and then it is up to Congress to make appropriations for the building of the project.

It will not cost the people of Porterville or Tulare County any money at all. It is all paid by the United States and Porterville will not be out anything, with a great deal to gain. If the cost should be 10 million or any exorbitant figure that has been thrown to the wind, it is not for Porterville to worry about. Uncle Sam pays the bill and Porterville will benefit by a large payroll of men employed for several years. Apart from this there would naturally be the purchase of some of the supplies from merchants here. We need the dam and must work for it. We want the payroll as well as further agricultural development and flood protection which will accrue.

We realize there are a few who may be forced to sell some land to the United States. This we are informed is only a small acreage. It is because dams are constructed by the Government under the law of eminent domain. When this is done the landowners are well paid for their land by negotiation, or if an agreement cannot be reached, the judge who tries the case would allow a liberal price. There are plenty of court records to prove this.

It has been said that Bartlett Park on the Tule River will be destroyed. Yes, it would be underwater as we see it now, but recreational areas on the shores of the lake will take its place. An example of this is at Lake Yosemite, 5 miles east of Merced. Lake Yosemite is primarily an irrigation reservoir. On its shore is a boathouse and boats to rent. Shade trees and picnic places there are aplenty. People go there from many miles around from that part of the San Joaquin Valley for swimming, boating, fishing, and different outdoor sports.

The Recorder has published statements of both sides of this matter. It is now more emphatic than ever that the dam should be built and is not only necessary but will be of great benefit to southeastern Tulare County.

About a year ago when ceremonies were held at the official opening of the Friant-Kern Canal at Friant Dam, Governor Warren addressed a large gathering of people in which he strongly urged conservation of natural resources in California with water as the paramount issue. He said that population would continue to increase in California and it is absolutely necessary to conserve every inch of water possible.

The city council of Porterville, the city manager and city engineer, realize the necessity of this dam and the great benefits to accrue. The Recorder hopes and believes they will remain firm in asking for an appropriation from the United States Government for this project.

While the city council has shown good judgment in this matter and has been taking proper steps, they should be given every assistance possible by the

citizens of Porterville as well as from all parts of southeastern Tulare County. There should be a Success Dam association formed of citizens of Porterville and from the farming community so as to promote proper expression of the necessity, as well as the good to accrue to the public on the whole from this project.

The United States Army engineers who have spent considerable time on a complete survey in years past are good, honest and competent men. They are experts on such matters since it is work which they have done in many places over many years. It is reasonable to believe that the flood danger will increase as time goes on. Riverbeds do fill up. We have no dredger here to dredge out the Tule River bed. As the bed fills with sand as a natural consequence, it is very plain that more floods will result.

When the Army engineers were in Porterville about a year ago and held a public meeting at the city hall, a representative of 80 farmers west of Porterville stated that he was authorized to make it plain to the public that these 80 farmers wanted the Success Dam built and that it was strongly needed both for flood control and irrigation.

The Success Dam will conserve a large amount of water for more irrigation than we have now. It will be needed more in the future. Whether or not all the water rights on Tule River are now taken up, the dam will conserve and make available a large amount of water that is now going to waste. This has all been taken into consideration by the United States Army engineers.

Progress and development of Porterville and southeastern Tulare County must not stop.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the 2d session of the 78th Congress did authorize the construction of the Success Dam as described in Flood Control Committee Documents No. 1 submitted during the session of the 78th Congress in its 2d session in 1944; and

Whereas the Success Dam is to be of earthfill construction with a capacity of 75,000 acre-feet for the avowed purpose of providing flood control and irrigation at an estimated cost in 1948 of $10,106,000, no part of which is yet authorized; and

Whereas the maximum peak flow from records taken over a period of 45 years before 1950 was 21,100 cubic feet per second and the estimated within bank capacities of the Tule River and Porter Slough between the Success Dam and Porterville is 7,800 cubic feet per second and

Whereas the committee document states that a sustained discharge from the spillway of 16,000 cubic feet per second will damage the city of Porterville; and

Whereas, on November 18–19, 1950, there occurred torrential rains falling as such on the existing snow pack at the highest elevations which created, according to the California division of water resources, the greatest flood of record on the Tule River, exceeding the previous maximum rain type peak of 21,000 cubic feet per second on March 1943; and

Whereas this flood did not inundate the city of Porterville and did no appreciable damage to that city, disproving the engineering data and assumptions upon which the design of the dam was based; and

Whereas this flood did inundate farmlands in the normal flood area between the proposed dam site and Tulare Lake but that no appreciable damage to the lands and property in this area resulted and should be classed as a nondamaging flood; and

Whereas, in 1867, within the memory of old residents, who were witnesses, 3 days and nights of warm rain melted the very heavy snow accumulation of the winter and caused a flood which vastly exceeded the maximum flood of record in November 1950; and

Whereas the flood of 1950 demonstrated that the standard project flood, upon which the construction of the dam was based, would not damage the city of Porterville if the river channel were cleaned, and would not cause damaging floods in the Tule River area and the Tulare Lake Basin; and

Whereas the construction of the Success Dam would not afford protection against floods of greater magnitude than the standard project flood and would, in fact, create a false sense of security and eventually result in a condition which would cause great damage and tragedy; and

Whereas the Tule River area is a water-shortage area and the average runoff is 137,000 acre-feet, no drop of which drains into the ocean; and

Whereas all of this surface and subsurface runoff is used for irrigation by individuals and by ditch companies with water rights established under the laws of the State of California or is pumped from the alluvial area immediately below the proposed dam site by the ranchers and the city of Porterville where it now furnishes a dependable water supply, while the surface runoff percolates into the sandy soils of the Tule River area and the Tulare Lake Basin where it adds to the lowering water table; and

Whereas in February 1947 there were on file in the California Department of Public Works applications for water from the Success Dam totaling 381,000 acre-feet made by 3 farmer groups in the Tulare Basin and the Southern San Joaquin Municipal District; and

Whereas no area could receive increased amounts of water through any canal system without depriving the present users of water rights which are long established and that this redistribution of water would necessitate the appropriation of individual's property and would result in costly and protracted litigation and resultant hardship; and

Whereas the committee document states that bedrock for the dam is 30 feet below the river bed and that the foundation is adequate to support an earthfill dam of maximum height considered herein; and

Whereas bedrock in 2 test holes is in excess of 100 feet and in a third test hole sunk to a depth in excess of 140 feet a bed of clay was encountered overlying a water strata of unknown thickness where the water pressure is almost enough to create an artesian flow at the proposed dam site; and

Whereas, this water strata undoubtedly supplies the alluvial area and the wells of ranchers and the city of Porterville in that area; and

Whereas the safe construction of the dam would necessitate a type of construction different from the one proposed and would dry up the wells owned by the ranchers and the city of Porterville; and

Whereas drying up the wells of the city of Porterville and the possible granting of the application of the Southern San Joaquin Municipal District for 100,000 acre-feet of water from the dam site pose a threat to the water rights of the users above the dam site through condemnation; and

Whereas, the Bureau of Reclamation, which traditionally administers irrigation waters from projects financed by Federal funds, does not recognize individual water rights and the Department is currently suing individuals in San Diego County for their water rights, claiming paramount right; and

Whereas the authorization of funds for the proposed dam would result in the condemnation of in excess of 5,000 productive acres of land, depriving many individuals of their homes and means of livelihood as well as removing this property from the tax rolls of Tulare County; and

Whereas the project is indefensible as a flood-control or an irrigation project and will cost vastly more than the estimated $10,106,000 and be a flagrant waste of public funds: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we the members of the Springville Center of the Tulare County Farm Bureau do hereby oppose the construction of the proposed Success Dam; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition the Congress of the United States to delegate a committee to reconsider the authorization for the construction of the Success Dam in the light of new evidence that the proposed dam is not necessary and is, in reality, harmful to the public interest.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto affixed my signature on this —— day of January 1952.

RALPH O. HILL,
Chairman, Springville Center, Tulare County Farm Bureau.
DORIS E. KILLIAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is engaged in the planning and designing of that certain flood-control and irrigation structure known as the Success Dam; and

Whereas the Success Dam if constructed will be located within the boundaries of the Tule River Soil Conservation District; and

Whereas soil-conservation districts organized under the laws of the State of California are required under division 9, paragraph 9261, of the Public Resources Code of the State of California to develop districtwide comprehensive plans for soil and water conservation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the directors of the Tule River Soil Conservation District as of this 27th day of April 1955, do hereby oppose any further planning, negotiating, or appropriating of funds pertaining to the Success Dam project until the Tule River Soil Conservation District can instigate and complete an overall comprehensive study of the Tule River Watershed; and be it further

Resolved, That as a part of our districtwide plan for soil and water conservation we do hereby indicate that it is our official intention to carry out the aforementioned study in order to discover the most feasible and economic methods of water conservation and flood control within the said watershed.

By our unanimous vote this official resolution is approved this 27th day of April 1955.

Tule River Soil Conservation District Board of Directors:

R. R. KILLIAN,
President.
RALPH GILL,
Director.
RALPH O. HILL,
Director.
WALTER M. MCNAB,
Director.
WM. DYE,
Director.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Killian, did I understand you to say that you feared under some State law that there would be a diversion of the water from this entire area?

Mr. KILLIAN. I know that there will be 75,000 acre-feet assigned after that dam is built.

Mr. HAND. That is part of your fear of the lack of water, by reason of a diversion by the State?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir; it will be diverted to remote areas, and the present balance, which is already confused, will be thrown out of further balance, and there are bound to be some losers in this thing.

That is the basis of the opposition.

Mr. MURRAY. Did you come down here on your own, or are you being sponsored by some group to testify before this committee?

Mr. KILLIAN. They passed the hat, and sent me back here. I am a farmer, and I should be back there farming, but I was asked to come here and make this presentation.

Mr. MURRAY. Who is "they?"

Mr. KILLIAN. All these organizations.

Mr. MURRAY. In other words, these organizations which you have named in the record are the ones who actually sponsored your trip here?

Mr. KILLIAN. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY. You are not only presenting your own case, but also their case; is that it?

Mr. KILLIAN. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. EVINS. We thank you very much, Mr. Killian.

Mr. KILLIAN. Thank you, gentlemen, for your very kind attention.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

WITNESSES

A. D. EDMONSTON, STATE ENGINEER AND EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE WATER PROJECT AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
NORTHCUTT ELY, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., SPECIAL COUNSEL, WATER PROJECT AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ROBERT L. McCARTY, OF ELY, McCARTY, & DUNCAN, WASHINGTON, D. C., OF COUNSEL

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear this morning Mr. A. D. Edmonston, State engineer of the State of California; Mrs. Northcutt Ely, and Mr. Robert McCarty. Is that right?

Mr. EVINS. What is your position, Mr. McCarty?

Mr. MCCARTY. My name is Robert McCarty. I am a member of the firm of Ely, McCarty, and Duncan, with offices in the Tower Building, Washington, D. C. Mr. Ely is special counsel for the Water Project Authority of the State of California. He was unavoidably detained but will probably be here in a few minutes. Mr. Edmonston is State engineer and executive officer of the Water Project Authority.

Mr. EVINS. Do you want to speak first?

Mr. MCCARTHY. If I may, I will make a brief opening statement.

Mr. EVINS. What projects are you interested in primarily? The Central Valley project?

Mr. MCCARTY. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed.

Mr. MCCARTY. The California legislature authorized the Central Valley project in 1933 as a State project, with construction to be under the direction of the water project authority. Revenue bonds to finance construction were offered by the authority to the Public Works Administration of the Federal Government. PWA approved the project, but on the condition that it be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation as a Federal project, with financing to be in accordance with reclamation law. Actual work on the project has been in progress since 1935.

Although this is a Federal project, the water-project authority has the responsibility for the State of making continuing studies of progress and of formulating recommendations for Federal appropriations believed necessary to the most economic development of the project. These recommendations will be offered by Mr. Edmonston.

In furtherance of the original intent of the State legislature in authorizing the project as State owned and controlled, that body in 1952 directed the water-project authority to study and report on the possibility of effecting a transfer of the Central Valley project from the Federal Government to the State. A draft proposal was submitted to the various Government agencies for comment and a report is now before the State legislature, together with a recommendation that Federal legislation be considered in order to return the project to State ownership and operation.

Mr. Edmonston will now give you the recommendations as to Federal appropriations.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be pleased to hear your testimony, Mr. Edmonston.

Mr. EDMONSTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am A. D. Edmonston, State engineer of California, and executive officer of the water-project authority of the State, on whose behalf I am appearing before you today in support of a request for an appropriation of $21,245,000 for the Central Valley project for the fiscal year 1956.

The water-project authority, created by State legislative act in 1933, is the official representative of the State of California in matters pertaining to the Central Valley project, units of which have been constructed or are now under construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The authority has been diligent in furthering the construction of the Central Valley project and has interested itself in matters concerning the sale of water and power made available by the project.

The work on the originally authorized units of the Central Valley project is practically completed, and the project is now functioning as planned and designed, in producing and transporting water and electric power to areas of use. Only sufficient funds to do incidental work on these units are still required.

Units of the project now nearing completion are Folsom powerplant and Nimbus afterbay dam and powerplant of the American River development. Folsom Dam was put into operation to store the waters of the American River on March 22, 1955, and it is proposed to start generation of electric energy by the power facilities some time this month. The Sly Park project of the American River development is also expected to be completed by July 1, 1955.

Much work remains to be done on the works of the Sacramento canals unit, authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation in September 1950.

As in the past years, the water project authority has had its engineers prepare a report covering the amounts of appropriations previously made for the Central Valley project through the fiscal year 1955; status of construction work on, and the costs of, the active features; status of the presently unauthorized features; and a recommendation as to the amounts of money which could be advantageously used for the project in the fiscal year 1956.

This report was presented to the water project authority at its meeting on February 16, 1955. At that meeting the authority adopted a resolution recommending the appropriation of the following amounts for expenditure on the Central Valley project features during the fiscal year 1956:

1. Shasta division:	
Shasta Dam and Reservoir	$70,000
Shasta powerplant and switchyard	850,000
Keswick Dam and Reservoir	7,000
Keswick powerplant and switchyard	21,000
Subtotal	948,000
2. Sacramento River division: Sacramento canals	10,000,000

3. American River division:	
Folsom power facilities	$1,000,000
Folsom transmission facilities	300,000
Nimbus fish protection facilities	280,000
Sly Park project	20,000
Subtotal	1,600,000
4. Regional office:	
Water rights	500,000
Preference customer meters	20,000
Radio network	2,000
Subtotal	522,000
5. Delta division:	
Delta fish protection facilities	1,345,000
Delta cross channel	50,000
Contra Costa Canal distribution system	400,000
Delta-Mendota Canal	200,000
Tracy switchyard	100,000
Subtotal	2,095,000
6. Friant division:	
Madera Canal	280,000
Friant-Kern Canal	800,000
Friant-Kern distribution system	5,000,000
Subtotal	6,080,000
Total	21,245,000

A copy of the resolution of the water project authority and a copy of the report entitled, "Central Valley Project—Construction Progress, Status of Costs and Recommendations for Congressional Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1956," January 1955, are being filed with your committee together with this statement.

That concludes my presentation, sir.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. McCarty and Mr. Edmonston, for your statements. Mr. Edmonston, are you State engineer for the State of California?

Mr. EDMONSTON. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And therefore you are not just supporting funds for any particular area but for reclamation projects and engineering projects throughout the State of California?

Mr. EDMONSTON. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. The total amount of the request you are supporting is $21 million plus?

Mr. EDMONSTON. That is for the Central Valley project. That is the Bureau of Reclamation project upon which I have testified.

Mr. EVINS. The total of all the Bureau requests amounts to how much?

Mr. EDMONSTON. I do not have the figures for all of the various projects in the State. The budget request for Central Valley is about $14 million. There will be a group before your committee this afternoon on flood-control projects.

Mr. EVINS. Your testimony this morning is directed solely to the Central Valley project?

Mr. EDMONSTON. The Central Valley project of the Bureau of Reclamation; yes. The requests that will come in this afternoon are for Corps of Engineers projects.

SACRAMENTO CANAL PROJECT

Mr. EVINS. You mentioned the Sacramento Canal project. Do the people out your way all favor that project?

Mr. EDMONSTON. Yes, sir. I do not think there is any opposition to the canals. But do you have reference to the Sacramento deepwater channel? That is quite a different project.

Mr. EVINS. Yes.

Mr. EDMONSTON. I am not appearing for or against that particular project, sir.

Mr. EVINS. It is rather controversial. I wondered if you could give the committee any light on that subject, either on or off the record, as State engineer of the State of California. If you would prefer, it can be off the record.

Mr. EDMONSTON. It will be all right to leave this on the record. The State of California, through the director of public works as an official representing the State of California, in reviewing the report of the Army engineers on the Sacramento deepwater channel—I have forgotten the year but it must have been 10 years ago—went on record supporting the project. The State since that time has officially, as I recall, not taken a position. At least, the department of public works has not taken a position subsequent to that time.

Mr. EVINS. Has there been any action by the State general assembly in the past 10 years?

Mr. EDMONSTON. I would have to check on that.

Mr. EVINS. The Governor of California sent the committee a telegram yesterday urging the support of that project.

Mr. EDMONSTON. I am speaking of action by the State department of public works. They have not taken a position on it, as I recall, since that original recommendation which may have been 10 years ago. I would have to check on that.

Mr. EVINS. The appropriation request that you are supporting is identical with the Bureau of the Budget recommendation?

Mr. EDMONSTON. They are recommending a total of $14 million this year. Last year the Congress approved $21 million. As to this year, we are asking more than the Budget figure on the Sacramento canals. I think they are recommending $4 million, and I am requesting $10 million. I do not think there has been enough money in the past for that.

Mr. EVINS. You, as State engineer, are not in the position to make a statement to this committee either for or against the project?

Mr. EDMONSTON. No. I have not been authorized to make a statement on the navigation project. I have been authorized to appear on this appropriation for the Central Valley project.

Mr. HAND. I would like to have one of you gentlemen comment on the proposed transfer to the State of California of this project.

Mr. ELY. For the record, my name is Northcutt Ely. I am special counsel for the Water Project Authority of the State of California.

The proposed transfer of the project from the Federal Government

to the State of California is a matter that has been under investigation by the water project authority under the direction of Mr. Edmonston's staff for some time pursuant to the direction of the legislature. They have submitted to the legislature their report pointing out the problems and the methods by which the transfer could be accomplished.

The difficulty in the way of a final and definitive recommendation from the State engineer's office to the legislature arises from the fact that the Department of the Interior has found itself so far unable to give us final answers on some of the key questions that have to be resolved before the State can reach a decision as to whether the acquisition of the project is feasible and desirable from the standpoint of the State. Why it is the Bureau of Reclamation has taken so long to give us answers on the policy questions, I am unable to say. There have been conferences on the subject over the past 2 years.

The most recent resulted in a memorandum dated November 23, 1954, signed by Assistant Interior Secretary Aandahl and Mr. Edmonston, which I will offer for the record later, together with a letter to Interior dated July 23, 1954 from Mr. Edmonston, covering a draft of a proposal for State acquisition of the project.

Mr. HAND. Is it may understanding the State of California desires to take over this project but has not done so because of delays on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation in giving answers to policy questions which have arisen?

Mr. ELY. The latter part is correct that there have been delays on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation. We cannot know whether it is feasible for the State to take over the project until these answers are given.

Mr. HAND. The State is at least contemplating the transfer to the State?

Mr. ELY. Yes. The State legislature authorized originally some $10 million, not only for a study of the feasibility of the transfer but also as a token payment. A portion of that appropriation, made in 1952, has since been diverted to other needs.

Mr. HAND. Is it proposed to pay the Federal Government for its capital investment?

Mr. ELY. Yes; the basic plan that has been under consideration is to keep the Federal Government whole as to the reimbursable features of the project. The nonreimbursables would be written off whether the Federal Government kept it or not. The main reimbursable features, power and irrigation, would be repaid by a combination of cash and bond issues, on a present-worth basis.

Mr. HAND. And if the transfer were consummated the project would be operated exclusively by the State of California? That is the intention?

Mr. ELY. That is correct.

Mr. HAND. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955.

CONTRA COSTA CANAL

WITNESSES

JOHN W. McFARLAND, GENERAL MANAGER OF EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT, OAKLAND, CALIF.
NORTHCUTT ELY, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., SPECIAL COUNSEL, EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
ROBERT McCARTY, OF ELY, McCARTY & DUNCAN, WASHINGTON, D. C., OF COUNSEL

Mr. EVINS. The committee will now hear Mr. John W. McFarland.

Mr. MCFARLAND. My name is John W. McFarland, I am general manager of the East Bay Municipal Utility District, which has headquarters in Oakland, Calif.

The East Bay Municipal Utility District is a publicly owned agency established under the laws of the State of California to furnish water in the East Bay area. We have invested about $77 million of our own local money in that area, which currently includes 14 cities, a large amount of unincorporated area, and about 1 million customers. We think we have been able to establish a successful locally owned operation without the need for requesting Federal aid.

The reason we appear today is to oppose a project that was proposed here some years ago to extend the Contra Costa Canal into a part of our area, in other words, a proposal to invade an already established public agency with another, using Federal funds.

We appeared in 1951 in opposition to this project and have been coming back every year on the same score. The results of these appearances have been that the appropriation bills have included language that prohibited the expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation of any funds for this project except for field engineering and survey work and the preparation of a report.

Last year when we appeared before the committee the Bureau's report was not available. However, about a week later the report was made available to the Congress, after studies both by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior.

The results of that study more or less proved our contention all along, and that was that the cost of water under that project would be no less than the cost of the water already available through our own organization, and therefore that the project is unnecessary. Not only is the project unnecessary, but I think it would establish a very bad policy in that it would provide Federal assistance for one public agency in competition with another.

I would like to read a statement from a letter dated March 11, 1954, to the Secretary of the Interior from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

> It would appear that the construction of the water supply system outlined by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, with Federal funds would place the Federal Government in the position of competing with an already existing local enterprise which, with the presently constructed system, is capable of providing the required water supplies at an apparently reasonable price.

That conclusion of the Bureau of the Budget certainly coincides with our conclusion.

What we would like to request today is that in this year's appropriation bill there very definitely be included language that would prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for the construction of this project.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. McFarland, whom did you say you represent?

Mr. MCFARLAND. The East Bay Municipal Utility District.

Mr. EVINS. Did you come here from California?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. How many years did you say you had been coming before this committee?

Mr. MCFARLAND. This is the fifth time.

Mr. EVINS. Do you not think it would serve you and your people and the committee and all concerned to advantage if we should resolve this issue either to go forward with the project or discontinue it and not have the necessity for your making a trip every year from California to oppose it?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I agree with you very heartily, sir.

Mr. EVINS. I am not too familiar with your situation. Just how would this other project compete with the one you are attempting to preserve and protect?

Mr. MCFARLAND. About 30 years ago we locally established this public agency on the East Bay. Our boundaries include about 200 square miles on the eastern side of San Francisco Bay. This proposed project we are discussing is desired by another district established recently within our already existing boundaries. The idea originally behind it was that by extending the Contra Costa Canal they would bring industrial water on a raw basis out of the canal and sell it at a price much less than ours. Our contention all along was that they could not sell water cheaper than we could, and even if they could, it was bad because any competing public agency within the area of an already established public agency is bound to have an adverse effect.

Mr. EVINS. Your agency is a municipal agency?

Mr. MCFARLAND. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. How widespread are its services?

Mr. MCFARLAND. We have 1 million customers.

Mr. EVINS. How many additional customers does the other facility propose to serve?

Mr. MCFARLAND. It proposes to serve potential industrial customers in the city of Richmond, Calif.

Mr. EVINS. How many in number in addition to those you presently serve?

Mr. MCFARLAND. We are already serving the customers they propose to serve, and to my knowledge there has never been any customer in Richmond who has indicated a desire to use this water even if it were brought in.

Mr. EVINS. Is your service adequate and sufficient in your opinion?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Absolutely.

Mr. EVINS. And the customers are satisfied?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And the rates are reasonable?

Mr. MCFARLAND. That is correct. Let me give you the outstanding example of that. The Standard Oil Company of California is the largest industrial user of water we have. They use about 5 million

gallons a day. That would be one agency that would be looking for a cheaper water supply if they could get it. We have worked closely with the Standard Oil Co. of California since our first visit here 5 years ago and have given adjustments in rates to large users which gives them a more favorable rate for such use, and they have stated to us, and I am sure the officers of that company would affirm this statement, that they are satisfied with the present rate structure and with the availability of the water.

Mr. EVINS. How much is proposed for this Contra Costa Water District?

Mr. MCFARLAND. The initial cost?

Mr. EVINS. The initial cost and the ultimate cost.

Mr. MCFARLAND. As far as I have been able to determine from the report of the Bureau of Reclamation, the original proposed cost would be between 6 and 7 million dollars. In additions there would have to be money spent locally for distribution works. That would be a local expenditure. But the Federal expenditure, according to this report, which is now almost 2 years old, is between 6 and 7 million dollars, as of that time, and in my judgment it would be in excess of that amount now.

Mr. EVINS. Could you tell the committee how much has been expended on the Bureau of Reclamation project to date?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I cannot answer that. My guess would be between $50,000 and $100,000 in making the survey.

Mr. EVINS. And you know of no crying demand or need for the additional facility?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I certainly do not, and if there were such a crying demand our organization is prepared to meet it. We feel we have an obligation to satisfy such a demand if there were one.

Mr. EVINS. And you are prepared to satisfy the demands if any should arise?

Mr. MCFARLAND. We are, and I think we are obliged almost by law to do that.

Mr. MURRAY. The principal purpose of the Contra Costa Canal is not to provide water in this district, is it?

Mr. MCFARLAND. No. It was originally established for irrigation purposes.

Mr. MURRAY. Do you feel the canal ought to be extended for its irrigation purposes?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I am not familiar enough with that possibility. That is a little bit out of our province. We do not supply irrigation water. That is another subject.

Mr. MURRAY. Your objection, then, is principally directed to the creation of a competitor to your water supply. Is that correct?

Mr. MCFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. The thing I am not too clear on is, are you now authorized by State law to service not only your East Bay Utility District but also the Southwest Contra Costa Water District?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes. You will notice on that map that the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District acually lies in the boundaries of our district.

Mr. MURRAY. Do you mean the legislature permits the creation of another water district within the limits of a previous one?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, it does. The Southwest Contra Costa Water District is formed under a different law than the law which established the East Bay Utility District, and it is possible to do that.

Mr. MURRAY. That is the thing that I was not too clear on. I did not think it was possible under State law to form a new water district within the boundaries of a previous water district.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is.

Mr. MURRAY. Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Jensen has been chairman of the Interior Committee in the past and is familiar with this matter. I would like you to make a statement, if you would, Mr. Jensen, for the record.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly agree with the gentleman now testifying. The Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations has for many years been receiving testimony on this project and I, as one member of the committee, always felt that there was no need nor justification for another public body to come in and compete with the municipal district which has been serving these people very well and at reasonable prices for the water. I say this advisedly because of the many years I have heard this project discussed before our committee. I would like to put an end to it once and for all, and I shall be pleased to join with the committee in writing language that will do just that, so that there will not be his constant expense to the Government of making these investigations, and the expense to these folk coming back here every year and testifying in defense of their own business, which I think has been run very well. I say this for the record so all may read. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. HAND. Has the position of the Bureau of the Budget remained the same since their letter of March 11, 1954, to which you referred?

Mr. McFARLAND. To the best of my knowledge it has.

(Mr. McFarland's formal statement, filed with the committee, follows:)

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. McFARLAND, GENERAL MANAGER, EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT

In the matter of proposed work to be performed by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with a propsed aqueduct from the Contra Costa Canal, Calif., to the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District, Calif.

My name is John W. McFarland. I am general manager of the East Bay Municipal Utility District, with headquarters in Oakland, Calif. The East Bay Municipal Utility District is a publicly owned nonprofit agency, operating under the laws of the State of California, and responsible to the people for the water supply of a sizable metropolitan area including 14 cities lying within 2 counties. Our customers currently number 1 million persons. In the 30 years of operation, $77 million in bonds have been voted by the people to pay for waterworks which have been constructed or purchased. No Federal aid has been necessary.

We appear today in opposition to a proposed project by which the Bureau of Reclamation would extend the Contra Costa Canal to the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District in the city of Richmond, Calif. This area already lies within the boundaries of the East Bay Municipal Utility District. This proposed project originated quite some years ago, and we appeared in opposition before your committee for the first time in 1951, and have appeared before your committee every year since. During this time, and as a result of this opposition, the appropriation bills have included language that prohibited the expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation of any funds for this project except for field engineering and survey work. The idea was that comparative

costs and feasibility should be studied and reports submitted to the Congress before any construction work was authorized.

Subsequent to our appearance before your committee in February last year, the Bureau's report was made available to the Congress, and was studied both by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior. The results of the study indicated that the cost of water through this proposed project would be no less than the cost of water already available through our own organization, the East Bay Municipal Utility District. Therefore, it is obvious that the proposed project is unnecessary. Further, and we quote from a letter dated March 11, 1954, to the Secretary of the Interior from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

"It would appear that the construction of the water-supply system outlined by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, with Federal funds would place the Federal Government in the position of competing with an already existing local enterprise which, with the presently constructed system, is capable of providing the required water supplies at an apparently reasonable price."

This statement sums up very well our own feelings in the matter and has been the basis for our continuing opposition.

We respectfully request that language be included in the appropriation bill for 1955 that would definitely prohibit the expenditure of any funds by the Bureau of Reclamation for the construction of this unnecessary project. Such language is suggested as follows:

"No funds appropriated by this or any previous Act shall be used for the construction of an aqueduct or extension of the Contra Costa Canal to the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District or City of Richmond, California; and no contract shall be negotiated by the United States or any officer thereof for the construction or financing of such aqueduct or canal unless and until the construction of the same shall have been specifically authorized by Act of Congress."

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Ely, did you wish to make a statement?

Mr. ELY. I have a prepared statement which I shall offer for the record, and would suggest that instead of the language which now appears in the budget at page 761, alternate language be substituted which I will read. The language now in the budget at page 761 is as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures, after submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior (1) on the cost and feasibility of said project, including the necessary distribution system and (2) on the rates required to be charged to the ultimate consumers.

Subsequently, as Mr. McFarland has indicated, that report was completed and has been submitted to the Congress.

It happened that during this interval, Congressman Condon, of California, introduced a bill in the House, H. R. 3691, to authorize construction of this project. The Bureau of the Budget, in reporting on the proposed project to the Interior Department, stated:

Accordingly, you are advised that while there would be no objection to the submission to the committee of your proposed noncommittal report on H. R. 3691, in the light of the above comments the Bureau of the Budget would not recommend its enactment at this time.

And at another place in the letter to the Interior Department, the Bureau of the Budget reported, as Mr. McFarland has indicated, that the construction of this project as outlined by the Bureau of Reclamation with Federal funds—

would place the Federal Government in the position of competing with an already existing local enterprise which, with the presently constructed system, is capable of providing the required water supplies at an apparently reasonable price.

Inasmuch as the report that is referred to in the proviso now in the budget has been rendered, there seems no occasion for language that assumes it has not been rendered. We consequently propose to put the matter at rest by a proviso which would read as follows:

Provided, That no funds appropriated by this or any previous act shall be used for the construction of an aqueduct or extension of the Contra Costa Canal to the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District or city of Richmond, Calif.; and no contract shall be negotiated by the United States or any officer thereof for the construction or financing of such aqueduct or canal unless and until the construction of the same shall have been specifically authorized by act of Congress.

We think that language is necessary because the Secretary of the Interior has authority under section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Act of 1939 to authorize projects that he finds feasible without bringing them to the Congress at all, and without such a mandate by act of Congress the threat remains over our head that at some time in the future the Secretary of the Interior will authorize and go ahead with the construction of this competing facility. We would like to have that possibility put at rest now and for all time so that before the Secretary of the Interior could revive it he would have to come before Congress.

We feel inasmuch as the report referred to in the proviso now in the budget has been rendered, there is no occasion to assume that this report is in suspense.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much gentlemen. Mr. Ely, your prepared statement will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY NORTHCUTT ELY, SPECIAL COUNSEL, EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT OF OAKLAND, CALIF., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE HOLDING HEARINGS ON BUDGET REQUESTS FOR FISCAL 1956

My name is Northcutt Ely. I am an attorney with offices in the Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. I am special counsel for the East Bay Municipal Utility District, Oakland, Calif., and appear before you with Mr. John McFarland, general manager of that district, and Robert L. McCarty of my law firm.

We appear in connection with a proposal to divert water from the Contra Costa Canal, in the Central Valley of California, by means of the so-called Richmond Conduit or aqueduct, in order to bring industrial water to the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District in Richmond, Calif. The problem is reflected in language contained at page 761 of the budget before you. That language is as follows:

"*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures, after submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior (1) on the cost and feasibility of said project, including the necessary distribution system and (2) on the rates required to be charged to the ultimate consumers:"

I would like to give you a brief history of this item before the Congress. The report referenced in the above language was furnished just after we appeared before you last year. Mr. McFarland will comment as to that report.

We first appeared on this matter in 1951, during hearings on Interior Department appropriation requests for fiscal 1952. A field investigation of this project was being conducted at the time. The House report (p. 10) summarized the situation as follows:

"Testimony indicates that $630,000 requested for Contra Costa distribution system was to be used for initiating construction of an aqueduct to serve the

Southwest Contra Costa County Water District which is within the boundaries of the East Bay Municipal Utility District on the east side of San Francisco Bay. Owing to lack of agreement between two competing public agencies the $630,000 item under reference has been deleted from the approved program. No funds in the accompanying bill, or previously appropriated, are to be available for the design or construction of works to deliver water within the boundaries of the East Bay Municipal Utility District, California."

The Senate restored the funds referred to but only to be used for other Central Valley project purposes—the prohibition against the use of the funds for this conduit was retained.

In 1952 following appearances before both House and Senate committees on fiscal 1953 appropriations, language identical with the proviso in the present budget became a part of the Interior Department Appropriation Act for fiscal 1953. The adoption of this language indicated the apparent feeling that since investigations of this project had been half completed, those investigations should be permitted to continue and report thereon made to Congress without, however, any contract being entered into or any construction actually being started.

The report contemplated was not completed at the time of hearings on appropriations for fiscal 1954 and fiscal 1955. Accordingly, we appeared before you again. The Interior Appropriations Acts for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 contained language identical with that contained in the budget before you, which I have quoted.

Shortly after we testified last year, the long-awaited report was completed and was transmitted to Congress in connection with H. R. 3691 introduced by Mr. Condon. This bill would have authorized the construction of the conduit we oppose. A letter dated March 24, 1954, from the Interior Department to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee advised:

"In presenting this report to your committee, this Department recommends neither that H. R. 3691 be enacted nor that it be not enacted. Our purpose is to furnish your committee with the factual data called for by Appropriation Act language quoted above in order to assist it in determining the course of conduct it may wish to follow in connection with the bill. The differences in view that many exist between the East Bay Municipal Utility District and the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District will no doubt be made known to your committee by spokesmen for these two organizations."

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in commenting on this proposed project by letter to the Interior Department dated March 11, 1954, determined that "the overall cost to ultimate consumers for raw, untreated water (would) amount to about 9 cents per 100 cubic feet."

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget stated further:

"There is at present a water supply available for industrial, as well as domestic, purposes in the Richmond area. The East Bay Municipal Utility District, a publicly owned, nonprofit agency, has constructed major facilities for a supply of 30,080,000 cubic feet daily, of which the utility district estimates it is currently using 15,374,000 cubic feet daily. The unused supply of 14,706,000 cubic feet daily is nearly 5 times the capacity of the project system outlined above. The district officials state that this present excess capacity is fully adequate to meet the future industrial requirements of the Richmond area as well as other areas within the district. The East Bay Municipal Utilities District states that in 30 years of its operation, $77 million in bonds have been voted by the people to pay for waterworks it has constructed or purchased. The utility district maintains it can furnish new industries with high-quality, treated, and filtered water through its system with adequate storage, pressure, and standby service at rates which have been decreasing more and more as the district's debt is retired. These rates, on a monthly rate schedule, as of September 1, 1953, were—

"For the first 3,300 cubic feet, $0.20 per 100 cubic feet
"For the next 30,000 cubic feet, $0.18 per 100 cubic feet
"For the next 300,000 cubic feet, $0.12 per 100 cubic meet
"For all over 333,300 cubic feet, $0.09 per 100 cubic feet"

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget concluded that the construction of this project, as outlined by the Bureau of Reclamation, with Federal funds:

"* * * would place the Federal Government in the position of competing with an already existing local enterprise which, with the presently constructed system, is capable of providing the required water supplies at an apparently reasonable price.

"Accordingly, you are advised that while there would be no objection to the submission to the committee of your proposed noncommital report on H. R. 3691,

in the light of the above comments the Bureau of the Budget would not recommend its enactment at this time. It will be appreciated if you will furnish a copy of this letter with the report you submit to the Congress."

In sum, the surveys authorized by the language of the appropriations acts for the past 3 years have been completed. The requisite report has been submitted to Congress. The executive departments have transmitted messages to the Congress which, although based on this report, are comments on separate legislation. To reflect the foregoing, and to insure that this project will not be instituted on the basis of departmental action, as it very nearly was in 1951 when we first appeared before you, we request that the following language be inserted in lieu of the language now contained in the budget:

"*Provided*, That

"No funds appropriated by this or any previous act shall be used for the construction of an aqueduct or extension of the Contra Costa Canal to the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District or city of Richmond, Calif.; and no contract shall be negotiated by the United States or any officer thereof for the construction or financing of such aqueduct or canal unless and until the construction of the same shall have been specifically authorized by act of Congress."

This language is substantially the same as enacted by you for the past 3 years. It merely recognizes that the report called for has been transmitted and, while omitting language as to the report, continues the prohibition against construction or contracting without a specific project authorization from Congress.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955.

SUCCESS DAM

WITNESS

HON. HARLAN HAGEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be glad to hear at this time from Congressman Harlan Hagen, of California. Congressman Hagen is a valued Member of Congress and a very able advocate, and we are pleased to hear him.

Mr. HAGEN. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you with respect to appropriations for Success Dam on the Tule River in California in my district. I will not go into the details of that project. I am sure the committee clerks and advisers and members of the committee are familiar with it.

Success Dam was authorized along with several others in California, including two others which either are in my district or control rivers which flow into my district, by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Two of these other dams are now completed and in operation. Two are uncompleted and completion of them is sought. Success Dam is one of the uncompleted dams.

The four dams I mention—the Success Dam on the Tule River; the Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River; the Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River; and Isabella Dam on Kern River—are all designed to prevent flood damage from their respective streams in case of high water and to prevent floodwaters from reaching the basin of Tulare Lake, which is in my district.

With the completion of the Isabella Dam and the Pine Flat Dam this flood problem in Tulare Lake has been reduced; however, on each of these streams there is a problem of flood all along the length of the river, and this is a justified flood-control project from that consideration alone.

The city of Porterville, Calif., which is a town of approximately 10,000 to 15,000 population, sits on the banks of the Tule River and it can be inundated in time of flood, which is a possibility almost any year in California where there is a heavy snow runoff from the mountains.

Briefly, that is the aspect of the Success Dam which has been called to my attention for presentation to this committee. Proponents of the project have been back before this committee each year since 1944, and to date the Government has spent some $400,000 in the planning of this project at a particular site.

I am in a somewhat difficult position here today for this reason; there has developed a serious area of opposition to the building of this dam, and I believe yesterday Mr. Killian of Springville, Calif., testified before your committee. Of course in building any dam you will have some area of opposition from the people who will have to move out of the basin site, and in each of these matters we have to determine which course of conduct satisfies the overwhelming majority of the people.

You will hear tomorrow, I believe, or perhaps later—today, from the proponents for a continuing appropriation for this project. I understand that the local proponents, and the State of California, acting through the water resources board, will seek a sum of approximately $110,000 for completion of planning. You will recall that $400,000 has been spent for that purpose already. I think that they will seek in addition a sum of approximately $1 million for initiation of construction.

I am urging you to appropriate the money for the completion of the planning, which is the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and of the Army engineers themselves.

I would say also instructions might go out from this committee to the engineers to resolve some of these questions which are at issue between the proponents and the opponents of this dam. I am personally aware of the fact that some of these matters should be settled in advance because otherwise there would be not only a reservoir left, but a reservoir of ill will as the result of these projects if they are not. That has happened on the Isabella Dam in Kern County, which was built by the Army engineers.

There was a dispute between the county and the Federal Government over the cost of relocating a road. There is a dispute between a substantial group of local people and the Army over the amount of water which will be permitted to stand back of that dam at all times to provide a lake rather than a mudhole. There is still a question of how much water there is made available for irrigation and who is going to get it.

Sinmilar questions are at isue in this particular project and should be settled. I personally would ask that the Army spend some of its money, this approximately $110,000 they are asking for, to go over the field, so to speak, with the opponents of the project who are rather late in the game, I might say.

The proponents have been working on this since 1935. They have spent a considerable amount of time and money on it and they are of course entitled to primary consideration. I am certain that with the money which is being sought here that the Army engineers can

do much to clarify some of these troubles, these troublesome issues, which are at stake in this question.

Therefore, my position is this: I ask for the appropriation of planning money and with the hope that the committee might instruct the Army to use some of this money for the purpose of resolving some of these thorny questions which are at issue in any project of this kind.

I am certain that the area of controversy will either be eliminated or greatly reduced, if that is done.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Hagen, for your very fine statement. It was most informative to me and I am sure to the other members of the committee. I think that you have made a most fair presentation of the situation. As you indicated, yesterday there was some testimony, very strong, opposed to the Success Dam. It was pointed out that it was most unusual testimony by certain members of the committee. It seemed to me that was the case in view of the fact that the Corps of Engineers has for a number of years recommended this project. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, yet one individual comes in and he testifies that he has been sent here by organizations and great numbers of people in opposition to it.

Now, this Success Dam is in the district that you represent?

Mr. HAGEN. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. And you are testifying that in your opinion the vast majority of the people favor the project and desire the project and want to see it go on toward completion?

Mr. HAGEN. I am forced to take that position on the grounds of sheer logic, on the disclosed record of support and opposition to date.

The proponents of this project are large numbers of people who are downstream from the dam site. There has been a constant flood threat which they recognized as early as 1935. They have spent a considerable amount of time and money securing the authorization of this project and securing appropriations for it. They have sent legal counsel back here annually since 1944, and of course they are entitled to recognition for that effort.

Now, there perhaps has always been some latent opposition in the area back of the dam. Nobody wants to move his home any more than a man whose house is on a new highway wants his property condemned so the highway can go through. But there is perhaps a larger area of opposition than that, but it is late opposition. As I indicated, in my opinion the proponents have the burden of profit as the result of these circumstances. If they can, before the dam is actually constructed, or before construction is undertaken, convince a majority of the people in the area that they have justice in their cause, I am certain that their Congressman, whoever it might be, would advocate whatever was in the interest of a majority of the people. But that demonstration has not been made to date. It has been felt by myself and others that this final amount necessary to complete the planning will provide some of the answers to some of the problems that trouble these people.

Mr. EVINS. One of the things that the State of California greatly needs, as I understand it, is water and the proper distribution of the water, and without this dam there will undoubtedly be flash floods, or wasting of water, and by the building of the dam water could be conserved and used properly. Is that the condition you state?

Mr. HAGEN. Yes, Mr. Evins. The principal benefit from this dam is the flood-control aspect, and secondary, of course, there is an irrigation benefit.

Mr. EVINS. What do you have to say contrary to the statement that has been given to the committee that there is no water wasted; that the water goes underground and actually it is beneficial for agricultural purposes under present conditions?

Mr. HAGEN. In a remote sense you can say that about any water anywhere in an arid area—it goes underground. However, that is not entirely true with respect to all of this water because in a flood year this water escapes into Tulare Lake, which is a landlocked lake area in my district, and it is lost completely because the strata below that body—which, by the way, is now under intensive farming and always is when it is not flooded—are impermeable, and once the water gets down there it does not get in the underground anywhere. Moreover underground storage is difficult to chart and is less satisfactory than surface flow where there are pressing immediate water needs.

Mr. EVINS. As I gather from your testimony, most of the opposition is from individuals above the proposed dam site?

Mr. HAGEN. In fairness to Mr. Killian—and I consulted with Mr. Killian and those who will speak to you later today—Mr. Killian maintains that there is an area of opposition below the dam site from the water users who feel that a capture of the water at this dam site will in effect deflect the flow of the water so that it will not recharge the underground under their lands. That, of course, is one of the disputes which I think could be settled by the Army engineers continuing their study. That is always a question—when you impound water in arid area what effect is it going to have on the underground water table in particular areas? In my opinion, the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Army Engineers, should always make that kind of determination in setting up these projects.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Hagen.

Mr. JENSEN. Congressman, it was testified that the State of California was holding, and expected to hold, prior rights to 75,000 acre-feet of water on this project and the opponents of this project feel by so doing they will be denied water which they have at this time and up to this time have had the privilege of using for irrigation. Would you have any comment on that?

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Jensen, I would say this: I feel personally that is an extremely grave area of factual information and decision. The normal flow of this river has been put to beneficial use for a long time. It is owned by various water users and it is inconceivable there are any unappropriated normal water supplies on this river. I cannot give you the figures, but any structure of this kind which impounds water at a higher elevation, and in a confined area, makes some additional water available, so to speak, because the evaporation loss is smaller at the higher elevation and in the more confined area of storage, and in that sense there is some water which the dam itself will probably create, so to speak.

I would say presently that the water is in effect nonexistent. There would be serious doubt in my mind whether there are any water supplies on the river which are presently usable, with perhaps minor exceptions, which are not already owned by somebody.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Killian presented a petition here signed by some 200 people who are above the dam in opposition to this project. There was almost 100 percent opposition to this project by the people above the dam. Also, there was scattered opposition below the dam.

Mr. HAGEN. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. As I understood his testimony, the opposition, generally speaking, was due to the fact that they were fearful they would have less water after the dam was built than they have now because of the fact that the State is going to demand prior rights on 75,000 acre-feet. Matters of this kind, of course, come before the committee on many occasions, and I think that the best thing this committee can do in order to make up its mind would be to get all the facts and figures that it is possible to get so that we can act intelligently and properly in this matter. That is the only purpose of this committee—to do the thing that is right and best for the great majority of the people.

Mr. HAGEN. May I comment on your last statement?

The lands back of this dam are all foothills. They are principally devoted to cattle raising. I understand there are only about 3,500 acres of land actually under cultivation.

The fact that cultivation and widespread diversion back of the dam site have not occurred to date, because irrigation is not new in California, is a very signifiacnt commentary on the fact it has not been very feasible. Quite recently under the stimulus of recent thinking about new methods of watershed protection in the building of small check dams high in the mountains, as contrasted with the big dam projects which the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have indulged in, these people feel that with some Federal assistance, either through Soil Conservation Service, or through a special act of Congress, or through this watershed conservation program, they would be assisted in building small check dams from which they would irrigate. But it is questionable in average water years they could do that without interfering with some vested rights to water belonging to people downstream. As I say, all the normal flow of this river, according to my understanding, has been appropriated for years. So really, if they would stop to analyze it, all they could expect to capture would be water in ponds in flood years.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Hagen.

Mr. HAGEN. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before the committee.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955.

ALASKA PROJECTS

WITNESSES

HON. E. L. BARTLETT, A DELEGATE IN CONGRESS FROM THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA
HAROLD B. SAY, MANAGER, WASHINGTON OFFICE, PORTLAND OREG., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
W. K. BOARDMAN, KETCHIKAN, ALASKA
M. C. COON, KODIAK, ALASKA
F. N. VAN HORN, SITKA, ALASKA

Mr. EVINS. At this time, we will hear Delegate Bartlett, of Alaska, our esteemed colleague. We are pleased to have you with us, Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I appear here with a number of Alaskans who have traveled the long distance from Alaska to Washington at the expense of local groups to plead for appropriations for rivers and harbors projects heretofore authorized.

I am grateful to you for giving us this opportunity to appear.

It follows, as a matter of course, that not all of the communities having authorized projects could send representatives down at this time.

HARBOR AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS AT SKAGWAY, ALASKA

Mr. Chairman, in my representative capacity for all the people of Alaska, I would like to appear here on behalf of all the authorized projects, and in order to save time for the people who have traveled so far to tell their story to you, I am going to content myself with offering a statement, if I may, for the record and present for your consideration, and I hope for inclusion in the record, a statement sent to me from Skagway, Alaska.

Mr. EVINS. It may be received.

(The statement referred to follows:)

HARBOR AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS AT SKAGWAY, ALASKA

The honorable members of your committee are respectfully referred to two authorized projects at Skagway, Alaska; namely a dredging program in the harbor; and a dike program in the Skagway River.

The dredging program provides for dredging at the face of a private wharf which is used for public use as a passenger, general cargo wharf and to service tankers discharging product for transmission via pipeline, or railway, to Northwestern Canada. Same program further provides for dredging of a badly needed small-boat harbor which was made obvious by the unfortunate disaster whereby a United States Coast Guard plane fell at Haines, Alaska, about 18 miles south of Skagway, and lives were lost; it was necessary to rush doctor and nurse from Skagway in small outboard motor craft in fairly heavy sea at a great risk. If Skagway had had a small boat harbor, fishing vessels would have been in the water instead of on the beach. The Alaska Territorial Legislature recently authorized $100,000 for this project, and it is possible to qualify for a matching fund from Alaska Public Works, which leaves everything provided for except dredging. Should dredging program be funded for one of these projects, it should also be considered for both programs, as the expense of taking dredge into

area would be more economical for the people. Estimates for this work approximate $44,500 in 1953.

The dike program consists of dike on east side of Skagway River from its mouth to a point north of railway shops. River has a tendency to eat into gravel bar on which is situated principal part of town, said railway shops being closer to point on river where this condition starts. Estimate for this project in 1953 is $757,000.

Skagway is at the head of Lynn Canal, northernmost part of so-called inside passage, and is ocean terminus for the White Pass & Yukon Route Railway operating 110 miles to the north to Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, Canada, an important distribution center in Northwestern Canada, and situated on the Alaska Highway. Two arms of said highway touch at Carcross, Yukon Territory, a point on said railway about 60 miles north of Skagway. While this route is only 18 miles in Alaska, it serves an area of thousands of square miles in our neighboring country with mineral, fur and oil resources. It is estimated that 50,000 tons of zinc, lead and other ore concentrates will be shipped via this railway this year, plus thousands of tons of asbestos. With present transportation requirements and current development programs, it is now felt that a highway between Skagway and Carcross is most necessary, and which emphasizes the importance of the port to the community. The defense and offense of North America are vitally concerned by proper facilities in this all-year port, as well as the economy of the north country. Skagway is a key point in civilian defense.

It is regretted that distance and the limited economy of this small American community does not lend itself to our making a better case for ourselves, but we feel confident that you will extend the same courtesy to consideration of this matter that you could expect from us.

(References: H. Doc. 414, 83d Cong., 2d sess. Annual report of the Chief of Engineers 1953, extract report upon the improvement of rivers and harbors in the Alaska District. Interim report No. 1—Harbors and Rivers in Alaska, Survey Report by North Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, dated February 15, 1952.)

PETERSBURG, ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to submit a copy of a letter which I received this morning sent to Gov. Frank B. Heintzleman, Governor of Alaska, by the Petersburg Chamber of Commerce.

I would like to also add, if I may, Mr. Chairman, a statement which I have prepared, a list of authorized projects in Alaska, and the cost thereof.

PETERSBURG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Petersburg, Alaska, April 30 1955.

Hon. FRANK B. HEINTZLEMAN,
Governor of Alaska, Juneau, Alaska.

SIR: We are submitting this data regarding our Petersburg Harbor project, which with others in the Territory, is approved by the United States engineers, and also by Congress. We respectfully request that appropriations be made to complete the project.

The following figures are the incoming and outgoing tonnages, all handled by boats during the years of 1953 and 1954, at Petersburg, Alaska:

	Tons
Commercial freight	12,750
Cannel salmon	6,600
Cold storage: Halibut, salmon, sable, shellfish, bait, and ice	28,000
Miscellaneous cannery supplies by small boats	650
Standard and Union Oil products	7,000
Total	55,000

Approximate number of local and visiting boats:	Number
Over 5 tons	110
Under 5 tons	90
Pleasure boats	100
Total	300
Steamer landings in 1953 and 1954	210
Mail boat trips in 1953 and 1954	150

	Value
Value of our operating boats and fishing gear	$4,000,000
Value of pleasure boats	100,000
Total value	4,100,000

Government boats based at Petersburg permanently:	Number
U. S. Coast Guard	1
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1
U. S. Forest Service	1
Total	3
Transient Government vessels	150

The population of Petersburg is about 1,700, and our assessed property value is approximately $5 million. Our banking record shows deposits of just under $3 million.

We own our own hydro- and diesel-electric systems, our own waterworks and hospital, both of which are new. We are rebuilding our hydroplant, including a new dam, which will about double our present hydroelectric power at a cost of about $1 million.

Our new concrete water dam and new pipeline extending into the city, gives us a 70-million-gallon water storage and costs were $325,000.

We have just opened up our new and up-to-date hospital which cost $250,000.

A program for improvement of our streets, water lines and sewers is now underway, and will cost around $400,000. This includes the paving of Main Street.

Our new high school completed recently cost $400,000, and in addition to our elementary school we have one of the very best gymnasiums in Alaska.

We have four salmon canneries, 2 shellfish canneries, and 2 good cold-storage plants. Good stores, hotel, apartments, marine ways, machine shops, oil stations, churches, clubs, other organizations, up-to-date fire department with latest equipment consisting of two trucks and a pumper, and a dial system phone just installed.

Our harbor is well protected and one of the very best in Alaska, but we badly need additional room in it. This harbor is an approved but an unfinished project. When it is completed we will put in the necessary floats, which plan is also approved by the United States engineers. When completed, the harbor will take care of over 500 boats, depending on the size of boats using it. All boat conveniences will be installed on the new floats.

Petersburg is a fishing center, and our boats bring in and we process almost all of the various kinds of fish and shellfish caught in the North Pacific waters.

Our entire economy is based on our boat traffic and our processing plants located along our shore line. We have no other economy to turn to, and without our boats and processing plants, Petersburg would cease to exist.

It is of the utmost importance to us to have sufficient harbor space of sufficient depth, and the floats and facilities to safely take care of not only our own home boats, but the many other fishing and pleasure boats that wish to use our harbor. This also includes Government boats that wish to use our harbor for safety and those Government boats that are stationed here permanently. Each of them also have private floats and warehouses in and adjacent to our harbor.

In listing the various things that make Petersburg and how dependent we are on boat operation, we earnestly request your assistance in bringing this matter before the appropriation committees, the Rivers and Harbors Congress,

and any other parties or organizations that can assist in getting for us the necessary appropriations to finish the project.

There are about 15 other approved harbor projects in Alaska, which total cost for improvement is around $12 million, and this is a very small sum as compared to the real good that their improvement will do for Alaska.

The United States engineers have full details concerning our harbor and all other approved harbor projects in Alaska.

Thanking you for your favorable consideration of our request, we are

Very truly yours,

EARL N. OHMER,
Chairman, Harbor and Navigation.

Authorized Alaska navigation and flood control projects

NAVIGATION PROJECTS

Project	Date authorized	Benefit-cost ratio	Current estimated Federal cost for completion
Craig: Dredging	Mar. 2, 1945	1.47	$341,000
Dry Pass: Channel	Sept. 3, 1954	1.25	1,471,335
Elfin Cove: Deepening entrance and channel	Mar. 2, 1945	[1] 1.58	162,000
Gastineau Channel: Channel through Gastineau Bar	do	[1] 1.78	1,010,000
Ketchikan: Small boat basin at Bar Point with breakwaters	Sept. 3, 1954	1.34	3,405,000
Kodiak: Small boat harbor 27-foot channel	do	1.37	1,778,000 110,000
Metlakatla: Breakwater	Mar. 2, 1945	2.82	383,000
Meyers Chuck: Small boat harbor	do	[1] .55	123,000
Neva Strait: Channel through Whitestone Narrows	Sept. 3, 1954	2.11	232,000
Nome: Dredging and extension jetties	Aug. 8, 1917 Aug. 30, 1935	(2)	852,000
Pelican: Small boat basin and breakwater	Sept. 3, 1954	1.87	311,000
Petersburg:			
Enlargement small boat basin	Mar. 2, 1945	[1] 1.99	227,000
Modification	Sept. 3, 1954	[1] 2.47	47,000
Port Alexander: Channel improvements	Mar. 2, 1945		97,000
Rocky Pass: Removal rocks	Sept. 3, 1954	1.76	247,000
Seldovia: Channel	Mar. 2, 1945	[1] .43	258,000
Seward: Harbor or refuge	Sept. 3, 1954	4.82	110,846
Sitka:			
Small boat basin, dredging	Mar. 2, 1945	2.78	891,000
Dredging, J. S. Forest Service Basin	Sept. 3, 1954	1.09	43,000
Skagway: Basin and dredging	Mar. 2, 1954	[1] 1.52	46,000
Valdez: Breakwaters	Sept. 3, 1954	2.8	120,600
Wrangell Harbor: Dredging and construction of breakwater north of Shakes Island	Mar. 2, 1945	1.36	520,000
Wrangell Narrows: Remaining work is dredging of anchorage basin	do	(3)	854,000
Subtotal			13,542,781

FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Gold Creek: Paving bottoms and sides	Sept. 3, 1954	3.32	$390,000
Skagway	July 24, 1946	[4] .53	768,000
Subtotal			1,158,000

[1] These benefit-cost ratios have not been recently revised.
[2] Some 62 percent of work completed.
[3] Project 80 percent completed.

NOTE.—1956 budget seeks $35,000 for planning Gold Creek flood-control work, $50,000 for maintenance work at Nome, and $30,000 for studies, a total of $115,000. Total estimated costs, navigation and flood-control projects:

Navigation	$13,542,781
Flood control	1,158,000
Total	14,700,781

Nome Harbor completion is in an inactive status. Port Alexander is in an inactive status.

BARTLETT STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, with a coastline longer than that of the Pacific Coast States the Gulf States, and the Atlantic States combined, Alaska is peculiarly dependent upon the sea. Indeed, its chief civilian industry is fishing. From the harbors of the coastal communities the fishing craft go out to take the world's principal supply of salmon and a very important part of its halibut, together with many other food fishes. Proper harbor facilities are of utmost concern to these fishermen and others who live by the sea.

The building or improvement of a small-boat harbor in Alaska is not an investment that will serve principally or even materially a recreational interest. It will house working craft. It will attract boats that now must go elsewhere for adequate shelter.

We have waited years and years—we have waited far too long—for the building of projects authorized by the Congress the construction of which is an urgent requirement. Nineteen projects have been authorized since and including 1945 clearing the way for appropriations for small-boat harbors or for necessary dredging works. In addition, two flood-control projects have been approved.

In my capacity as representative for all sections of Alaska, I am necessarily in the position of urging prompt action for all of them. By the special request of the city government of Skagway I have already made available for the committee statements prepared there and sent by airmail to me here at Washington. The flood-control project at Skagway is indeed a worthy one as you will gather from reading these statements. All of the rivers and harbors projects in Alaska are estimated to cost something just over $13 million and the flood-control projects just over $1 million. It is true that the Bureau of the Budget has made no request for funds for any single one of these yet I submit to you that in a very proper sense the Alaska projects can rightfully be placed in a special category—that criteria generally applied by the Bureau of the Budget against construction funds for undertakings of this nature should not be directed against Alaska where the need is not incidental but instead compelling, and where the expenditure of funds by the Federal Government would be so quickly reflected in increased business, in community betterment, in saving of property and sometimes in saving of life.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that Alaska has a coastline longer than those of the Pacific coast, the Gulf States, and the Atlantic States combined.

We have here relatively few rivers and harbors projects and flood-control projects, the total cost of which would be less than $15 million. We live by the sea and years and years have gone by without a single appropriation, save one last year, for these essential small-boat harbors in Alaska, because the Bureau of the Budget never approved any submission.

I would like to introduce to you now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Harold B. Say, of the Portland, Oreg., Chamber of Commerce, to appear in behalf of Alaska communities.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Say, we will be very glad to hear you.

Mr. SAY. Mr. Chairman, my name is Harold B. Say, I am the Washington representative of the Portland, Oreg., Chamber of Commerce and my office is located at 1737 H Street NW.

Mr. Chairman, my statement will be very brief. I just want to say for the Portland Chamber of Commerce that we are highly interested in the development of Alaska, all activities. We have a very selfish relationship up there, as well as, you might say, an equity interest, if you wish to call it that.

We would like to see the communities, and Petersburg, in particular, developed. We take an interest in their small-boat harbor projects, a $251,800 item, which has been authorized but again not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

I would like to file a very brief statement in support of what I have just said, plus a telegram from the Petersburg Chamber of Commerce on the volume of business in and out of their port, the importance, in their eyes, of the development of this local boat harbor; and along with that, a brief letter from Mr. R. L. Clark, president of the Portland Chamber of Commerce on the same subject.

Mr. EVINS. They may be received.

(The statement, telegram, and letter follow:)

STATEMENT OF HAROLD B. SAY, MANAGER OF THE WASHINGTON, D. C., OFFICE OF THE PORTLAND, OREG., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

My name is Harold B. Say, manager of the Washington, D. C., office of the Portland Chamber of Commerce.

On this occasion our chamber in Portland, Oreg., has asked me to appear before you to urge that this committee does recommend the needed funds for carrying out the Petersburg, Alaska, Harbor project.

Oregon, Portland in particular, has long been concerned in the development of Alaska and its resources. Development of Alaska means more business for our community. More business and payrolls also translated in added direct revenue returns by taxes.

The Portland Chamber of Commerce desires to go on record as supporting the proposed Petersburg Harbor project which your committee has before it.

The Petersburg Chamber of Commerce yesterday telegraphed to me some data on commerce entering and leaving the port which I would like to introduce into the record.

We do urge thorough consideration of this project.

(Telegram attached.)

PETERSBURG, ALASKA, *May 2, 1955.*

HAROLD SAY,
Washington, D. C.:

Petersburg Harbor project authorization, House Document 179, 67th Congress; House Document 647, 71st Congress, 2d session; House Document 260, 76th Congress, 1st session; 42,000 additional authorized 1952, following figures on incoming and outgoing tonnages 1953 and 1954: Commercial freight—12,750 tons canned salmon; 6,600 tons cold-storage halibut; salmon, sable, shellfish bait, and ice, 28,000 tons; miscellaneous cannery supplies by small boat, 650 tons; standard and Union Oil products, 7,000 tons; approximate number of local and visiting boats over 5 tons, 110, under 5 tons, 90; pleasure boats, 100; steamer landings, 1953–54, 210; mailboat trips, 150; value of operating boats and fishing gear, 4 million; value of pleasure boats, 100,000. Three Government boats stationed here; transient Government boats, 150.

Thank you for your best efforts before Appropriations Committees.

PETERSBURG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Portland 4, Oreg., May 2, 1955.

Mr. HAROLD B. SAY,
Manager, Portland Chamber of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SAY: As you know, the Alaska committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce has just sponsored and concluded its seventh annual trade tour to Alaska.

Seventeen Portland businessmen made this tour which covered all of the principal business centers in western and southeastern Alaska, leaving Portland on April 6 and returning to Portland on April 20.

Petersburg, Alaska, was included in the tour group's itinerary, and each time in recent years that this community has been visited by our tour groups, our people have returned and have spoken enthusiastically about the Petersburg area as having a particularly bright industrial future.

Petersburg is one of the Territory's important fishing, canning, and processed-food centers. Large deposits of peat and one of the best protected harbors in the

territory are two of its features which should attract capital seeking sound investment prospects. Commercial stands of spruce and hemlock offer rich opportunities for pulp milling. One of the principal deterrents for these industries at the present time is the lack of adequate channel and harbor facilities.

Members of our Alaska tour this year have impressed upon me the urgency of adequate harbor facilities for Petersburg if the city is to continue to progress in relation to its vast resources which are available for development. There are 3 salmon canneries, 2 large cold-storage plants, and 2 shellfish operations. The population of Petersburg today exceeds 1,600 and with the development of its potential pulp and plywood industries could easily double or triple its population in the next decade.

The relatively small amount of money required by the United States Corps of Engineers for widening and deepening its present channel and harbor seems very modest in relation to the great amount of good to be derived from this area through the development of its natural resources. We in the Portland Chamber of Commerce ask you to appear before the Public Works Subcommittees of the House and Senate and urge them to recommend that an appropriation be included in the amount of $251,800 which we understand will permit the United States Corps of Engineers to complete the recommended project for the Petersburg Harbor which would give them an adequate channel and harbor.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. CLARK, *President.*

SMALL-BOAT BASIN, KETCHIKAN, ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Next, Mr. Chairman, I would like you to hear Mr. W. K. Boardman, of Ketchikan, Alaska.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Boardman, the committee will be glad to hear you at this time.

Mr. BOARDMAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is W. K. Boardman, manager of the Ketchikan, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce.

I would like to say first, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your subcommittee, and I have attached a summary statement which covers the situation as we see it.

I represent the community of Ketchikan in the capacity of a group which is interested in fishing, union and commercial groups, which subscribed to the so-called program to send me back here.

Ketchikan is described as more or less the salmon capital of the world. We have six salmon canneries within our local limits. We have three large cold-storage plants and Alaska's largest sawmill.

This is the port of entry into the Territory and the port of departure when you leave the Territory for the Puget Sound area. We are subjected to a tremendous flow of transients and marine traffic through that port, particularly during the halibut and salmon season. They come up there and fan out all over the Alaskan fishing grounds.

Last year the new $60 million sawmill was completed at Ketchikan, the first one in Alaska. It is employing about a thousand men in the mill and in the logging operations throughout the area. The $60 million investment was entirely privately subscribed, financed through bond issues of four life-insurance companies and the equity capital was put up by two corporations. It has an annual payroll of about $7 million; it uses boats entirely for logging operations. They are located on an island separate from the logging operations and they have to tow the logs in and have to supply the entire arrangement with boat operations.

We have a registered fleet in Ketchikan of more than 2,000 boats of every description. We have more than 1,000 on the city assessment rolls. There are more than 1,500, we estimate, actually living there and operating out of that port alone.

Delegate Bartlett has already touched upon a point that completely delineates our problem from those found earlier in the United States. We have only one source of supply in our area, and that is from marine traffic, over the coastal region of southeastern Alaska and on out toward the western end. Our community is located on isolated and separate areas and we have absolutely no access to highways or railroads of any type.

The help that the Government of the United States gave in the development of some of the original land grants to railroads and highway systems can only be paralleled in our area by helping develop this type of effort. That is the only type of thing we can use to develop our communities, to take care of the existing needs we have in that respect.

We naturally do have this suggestion, that we suffer a great deal of damage annually, due to improper facilities, the productive fisheries and the timber resources that are in the area. The largest force of the segment of the fleet can go south for wintering purposes and cuts down on our fishing activities to that extent.

Our particular project has a very favorable—at least a favorable benefit-cost ratio. The Army engineers originally came up with a ratio that was developed, of course, before this development; a complete survey has been made before this new $60 million sawmill was built, and the benefits have been augmented since that time, although it is not reffected in their figures.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I can state that the engineers have recommended this project, and it was authorized by the last Congress in the amount of $2,947,000.

However, the engineers did feel that one segment of the breakwater could be diverted temporarily, or perhaps permanently, and that would reduce the initial cost to $1,900,000.

We can only appeal to you gentlemen and we do certainly appreciate the privilege of appearing before you.

Mr. Bartlett has done a wonderful job on our behalf up there; however, we have an active voting representation and I certainly appreciate the opportunity of being before your committee this morning.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Boardman. I am sure that all of the colleagues of Representative Bartlett will concur in the statement you have just made, that regardless of party lines, he is doing a wonderful job for the people whom he represents. We are certainly glad to give testimony to that effect. However, I can say for all of us that we like for the people from our areas to come down and give us support now and then.

Now, are the funds you are requesting identical with the amount of funds which the Bureau of the Budget has requested, or what the Corps of Engineers suggested?

Mr. BOARDMAN. It is identical with the original amount authorized by the last omnibus bill of the Congress, in the last session. I am not sure of your question with reference to the Bureau of the Budget. The project has not been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. EVINS. Your testimony was directed solely to the Ketchikan project, Mr. Boardman?

Mr. BOARDMAN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Here are some pictures, Mr. Chairman, of the harbor presently existing; this shows the boat basin which was originally designed to accommodate 300 boats, and we have upward of 1,500 using the boat basin. You can see the crowded conditions which present a fire hazard and a damage hazard.

Mr. EVINS. The picture certainly depicts a crowded situation.

Mr. BOARDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a word in behalf of the Skagway problem. Mr. Bartlett has already presented it very briefly. They do have a small dredging program, and they are pleading here for an amount of about $45,000. The situation at Skagway is right at the head of the canal here, in southeastern Alaska, which is the focal point of this tremendous potential Alcoa aluminum project, which is the counterpart of the one down in British Columbia, south of Ketchikan. The community is really sitting on a powder keg up there if that situation ever develops.

This is a dredging situation which is a small one, and they have a dike situation over here on the river which flows alongside the town, and it is really needed; it parallels the airport, and I would like to enter this plea on behalf of their project at this time.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Boardman.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Boardman, these pictures are interesting; they show the extremely crowded conditions in certain sections of the harbor and, apparently, at some points within the harbor.

How much water do you have in the harbor; how many acres approximately?

Mr. BOARDMAN. I would say about 8 to 10 acres in that area. It was built 25 years ago.

Mr. HAND. In the whole harbor?

Mr. BOARDMAN. I would guess about that, yes. It may look larger than that, if my eyes deceive me. I moved from a corn-growing area in Iowa, to a salmon area.

Mr. HAND. You mentioned something about a proposed reduction in cost, by the elimination of some of that work; what was that?

Mr. BOARDMAN. We have got a situation where, from the southeast, we get heavy storms in that area.

The other jetty they eliminate would guard against the so-called northwestern, which we have never had and there is a 450-foot area that they propose to take out, and it would be a very sensible thing to do in my opinion.

Mr. HAND. That would reduce the cost how much?

Mr. BOARDMAN. About 1 million.

Mr. HAND. And it would leave the cost estimated at about what?

Mr. BOARDMAN. $1,900,000.

Mr. HAND. $1.9 million?

Mr. BOARDMAN. Yes.

Mr. HAND. There is just one other thing that I want you to clear up. You were talking about 22,000 boats?

Mr. BOARDMAN. 2,100.

Mr. HAND. 2,100?

Mr. BOARDMAN. Yes.

Mr. HAND. And you said there were 1,000 on your rolls.

Mr. BOARDMAN. That is, on the city assessment rolls, within the corporate limits of the city. There are two sources of registry, the Coast Guard and the Customs. We have 2,100 boats in Ketchikan registered in the Customs and in the Coast Guard registry.

Mr. HAND. In Ketchikan alone?

Mr. BOARDMAN. Yes.

Mr. HAND. Are these boats primarily engaged in fishing?

Mr. BOARDMAN. Entirely.

Mr. HAND. Entirely in fishing?

Mr. BOARDMAN. Fishing, plus supply operations.

Mr. HAND. Do you have an estimate as to the annual catch of fish of boats using the Ketchikan port of entry?

Mr. BOARDMAN. The salmon pack will run from probably 300,000 cases up to better than a million and a quarter, at the peak period; at $20,000, depending upon the market, it would run from 12 to 25 million dollars, for the salmon pack.

Of course, there is a big halibut processing there too, the halibut pack. They put up usually around 55 million pounds a year; jointly, we try to get about 6 million in the plant there.

Mr. HAND. What is the purpose of this? Is that for protection within the harbor?

Mr. BOARDMAN. No; that is for protection of the breakwater; that is the sole breakwater harbor protection we have.

Mr. HAND. What is that I see beyond? Is that the open sea?

Mr. BOARDMAN. That is a narrow channel. There are ocean steamers that come in and continue on up north to Wrangell and Juneau. That is the network of confined waterways in southeastern Alaska. We are on an island village, as you know. It is about 140 miles around it.

Mr. EVINS. One further observation: When you testify for the development of the boat harbor in Alaska, you are not submitting statements in support of a recreational harbor; it is for commercial and industrial use?

Mr. BOARDMAN. Absolutely; there are no recreational aspects about it. There is a small fleet of recreational boats there, but that is the whole economy in that area—fishing and timber resources.

Mr. EVINS. But you emphasize that it is not recreational, or a hobby for the people there, but it is for commerce and industry?

Mr. BOARDMAN. Strictly commerce.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, if you will permit, in my prepared statement, which I did not want to take the time of the committee to read, I emphasized that is true likewise for every last one of these coast of Alaska projects; all of these are commercial type projects.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I will say to you and our friend, the Delegate from Alaska, that I do not want you to cry down the value of recreation too much, because, in my State, recreation is a billion-dollar industry.

Mr. EVINS. Of course, I was not intending to cry down on it at all, Mr. Hand, but there has been some testimony before the committee heretofore concerning the development of small-boat recreational harbors; and I want to point out for the record that I understand that

this is not just a small-boat recreational harbor, but, as the last gentleman here indicated, that area was intended for commercial use.

Mr. BOARDMAN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. With no idea of minimizing the importance of recreational developments of small-boat harbors and other places.

Mr. HAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOARDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do have the original letter from the president of the Ketchikan Pulp Co. which I would like to present for the record.

Mr. EVINS. It may be made a part of the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

KETCHIKAN PULP CO.,
Bellingham, Wash., March 14, 1955.

To the Chairman and Members, Subcommittee on Public Works,
Senate Appropriations Committee, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The 83d Congress authorized the Bar Point Harbor project at Ketchikan, Alaska, in the amount of $2,947,000 but appropriated no funds for its construction. The need for the project, as we see it, centers around the following facts.

Our organization, which was formed as a joint venture by the American Viscose Corp. of Philadelphia and the Pudget Sound Pulp & Timber Co. of Bellingham, has invested a total of $59 million in the plant and logging facilities at Ketchikan and its immediate area. This investment was furnished by private capital sources and as a result we have created a facility producing new wealth out of what was heretofore unused timber wilderness. We have created, directly and indirectly, approximately 1,000 new outlets for employment in Alaska that before were nonexistent. Ours, we believe, is the largest single private industrial development, both from the standpoint of capital invested and employment created, that has ever been established in Alaska. We might add that the pioneering problems encountered from the inception have been great and that new and serious ones are continually being encountered.

We are doing business with some 32 logging operators in the immediate Ketchikan area, all of whom use or depend on boats and vessels of one description or another in their operations and who use the port of Ketchikan as their central supply point. We understand there were only about five such operators in the Ketchikan area prior to the time we commenced operations. Logging in the area is a marine operation and involves the extensive use of boats including the general classifications of camp tenders, boom boats, supply boats, and towboats. The logging camps are all located on islands separated by water from our mill at Ketchikan.

Harbor facilities in Ketchikan to accommodate this new fleet of vessels resulting from our operation are practically nonexistent.

There is at present a small-boat basin in Ketchikan capable of handling about 300 small vessels. However, Ketchikan is commonly referred to as the salmon capital of the world and has 5 salmon canneries within its corporate limits as well as 3 large fish-processing cold storage plants and many other businesses using marine vessels in their operations. The largest lumber mill in Alaska is located at Ketchikan and there are many other salmon canneries in the immediate area that are serviced out of the community. There are more than 2,000 vessels of all descriptions of Ketchikan registry and we are informed the assessment rolls of the city itself show that more than 1,000 boats are owned by individuals and firms within the corporate limits of the city. Ketchikan is also the first port of entry on entering Alaska and the port of departure is also Ketchikan when leaving Alaska for marine traffic plying between Puget Sound and Alaska using the protected Inside Passage and as such is subjected to a terrific burden of transient traffic, particularly during the periods when the halibut and salmon seining seasons are open in the Territory and its adjacent waters.

All of these factors combine to make it imperative that the Bar Point Harbor be constructed at Ketchikan to accommodate the overflow of vessels that cannot now obtain adequate and protected mooring facilities. The harbor as designed would accommodate 500 vessels of all descriptions and can be further expanded in capacity at a later date if needed. The cost of the project is too great for local financing and Territorial financing is out of the question, we understand,

because of very limited funds and the large number of other similar harbor projects that have been authorized in the Territory by Congress.

We consider the Bar Point Harbor project necessary because it will assist in increasing the productiveness of the timber resources in the Ketchikan area by providinng the necessary protected port facilities not now available for the fleet of vessels used in the overall local logging effort. Our stake in the Ketchikan area of Alaska is great and, as pointed out previously, we have created important new payrolls and wealth in what was heretofore a wilderness and have done it entirely with private financing. We trust that it is not out of line to suggest that a partial assist from the Federal Government in the form of continuing its historic role of providing harbor developments at key seaports points is in order. Ketchikan, in our estimation, falls within this category and we urge that the Congress appropriate the amount authorized by the 83d Congress for the construction of the Bar Point Harbor.

Respectfully submitted,

LAWSON TURCOTTE, *President.*

KODIAK SMALL-BOAT BASIN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, our next witness is Mr. M. C. Coon, vice president of the Chamber of Commerce of Kodiak. I would like the record to show that Mrs. Coon is in town with her husband and is so interested in this matter that she came over here to hear the testimony, from Virginia.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be glad to hear you, Mr. Coon.

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, my name is Merrill Coon, Post Office Box A-500, Kodiak, Alaska.

First, I want to thank the committee for its kind indulgence.

Kodiak, Alaska, is located at the northeast end of Kodiak Island in the North Pacific.

The United States naval base, or the 17th Naval District, is located approximately 6 miles west of the town of Kodiak, at Womans Bay. Kodiak was founded in 1793 and is one of the oldest towns on the Pacific coast. It was basically a fishing village, with its basic economy being products from the sea.

I will not reiterate, Mr. Chairman, what Mr. Boardman has said, but I would like to bring out one point, so far as we are concerned. The channel project for which moneys were appropriated last year and being completed this year is not the same as the small-boat basin which we are requesting money for now. It is a project, a haven for small-boat anchorage, and as Mr. Boardman has said, boats to us are what the railroads were to the States in the early days. Most of our travel is by boat. We are on an island, and our economy is based on fishing boats.

Now, just to bring out a few points: We have developed a fishing industry called the king crab. In 1950, there were about 64,882 pounds.

In 1951, it was 191,161 pounds; in 1952, 538,115 pounds; in 1953, 817,397, and in 1954, 3,264,204 pounds.

Now, the fishermen, beginning with 1954, were 5; second year, 86; third year, 66; fourth year, 129, and the fifth year, 170.

The number of cannery workers were 89 in 1954; the cannery payroll was $181,586; the capital investment in the canneries, $350,000; the number of boats engaged, 60; and the capital value of the boats, $840,000, and, as I said, the number of fishermen, 170; and the value of the 1954 pack was $975,795.

Mr. HAND. Are you talking about the king crab?

Mr. COON. Yes.

The fishermen right now are studying the scallops and shrimp. They have brought in a considerable amount.

We in Kodiak have a cold-storage plant that was started and, with the development of a small-boat harbor, everything is going to interlock; there is going to be more boats there engaged in fishing for scallops, shrimp, crab, plus our other industries which work in salmon.

We are going to try to create more stable employment. In summertime we have fishing for salmon, which will be in July and August. If we had this facility there, the boys could go out and fish from this harbor, fish for halibut. This is a small-boat harbor. It stays right there in Kodiak. We have some facilities, decent facilities, for them, but there have been thousands of dollars spent every year because of boats being damaged at the dock, rubbing up against each other, breaking up their guard rails on the boats.

Mr. EVINS. You may have the privilege of including your entire statement in the record if you wish, Mr. Coon.

Mr. COON. Thank you.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY M. C. COON RELATING TO THE KODIAK SMALL-BOAT BASIN AT KODIAK, ALASKA

The people of Kodiak have been endeavoring for many, many years to secure a small-boat harbor, a haven for approximately 200 boats. A great deal has been accomplished toward its ultimate realization, but the fact remains that the project is not completed.

Kodiak, Alaska, is located at the northeast end of Kodiak Island, in the North Pacific.

The United States naval base, or the 17th Naval District, is located approximately 6 miles west of the town of Kodiak, at Womans Bay.

Kodiak was founded in 1793 and is one of the oldest towns on the Pacific coast. It was basically a fishing village, with its basic economy being products from the sea.

Before the establishment of the United States naval base at Kodiak, Alaska, the population of the town was approximately 500 people. Since the construction of the naval base the population is between 1,500 and 2,000 people. The personnel at the base, both military and civilian, is between 2,500 and 3,000 persons.

The northern part of Kodiak Island has come timber—poor quality spruce—but the island abounds in good grass for grazing of cattle and sheep.

Our annual rainfall is approximately 64 inches, and our weather in general is moderate. Kodiak is south of Juneau, Alaska, and affected by the Japanese Current.

Kodiak Island is centrally located in a fishing area, salmon, halibut, crab, shrimp, scallops, and bottom fish. The Kodiak Island area has never been known to have had a salmon or halibut fishing season failure.

There are many economic and other justifications for a small-boat harbor at Kodiak. To keep this statement, or brief, from going into lengthy dissertation, I shall make brief mention of the principal ones:

1. Kodiak has no harbor protection for small boats. Thousands of dollars are spent each year for repairs for lack of protection.
2. Boats have been destroyed, or have lost a season, because of damages.
3. Kodiak is immediately adjacent to the principal halibut banks.
4. Kodiak has never experienced a fishing season failure.
5. Kodiak Ice & Cold Storage has partially constructed a cold-storage plant.
6. Kodiak has established and is expanding crab fishing.
7. Kodiak is the only city in Alaska with a population over 1,000 that is without a protected anchorage.
8. More boatowners would establish their residence at Kodiak if there were adequate facilities.
9. Cattle raising will increase. There have been several cattlemen from the States who have been impressed.
10. Maintenance and operating costs would decrease; insurance rates should be affected.

11. A more year-round employment will be established.
12. Boats have left Kodiak because of poor facilities.
13. A small-boat harbor would create new businesses—marine ways, repair, and machine shops, you-rent-a-boat.
14. We lack roads, harbor facilities; would encourage more boating, thereby building morale for both military and civilian.
15. At the start of the last war small boats in Kodiak were requisitioned for partial duty. Having a small-boat harbor would have made available more desirable types of boats.

The city council of the city of Kodiak has made reaffirming assurance through its resolution No. 14–54, dated 13th day of September 1954 (copy attached).

The benefit cost ratio is 1.37.

Listed below are some interesting figures as far as our king-crab industry is concerned:

Year	Pounds round weight	Fishermen
1950 [1]	64,882	5
1951	199,161	86
1952	538,115	66
1953	817,397	129
1954	3,264,204	170

[1] Compiled by Alaska Department of Fisheries, period Jan. 1 to Nov. 30, 1954. Does not include Wakefield Canneries whose production is estimated at 200,000 and does not include floating freezer ships operating in Kodiak waters.

Kodiak District, king-crab industry, 1954

Number of cannery workers	89
Cannery payroll	$181,586
Capital investment (canneries)	$350,000
Number of boats	60
Capital value of boats	$840,000
Number of fishermen	170
Value of 1954 pack	975,795

Wakefield Cannery and offshore floating freezer ships excluded.

The above figures were secured from a joint statement by the city of Kodiak, and Kodiak Chamber of Commerce, to the United States Tariff Commission, December 4, 1954.

We wish to bring to the committee's attention that the channel project, Document No. 332, 76th Congress, 1st session, was to improve navigation for large boats, and moneys were appropriated last year. Contracts have been issued and work is to be completed July 15, 1955.

The small-boat harbor project is Document No. 465 of the 83d Congress, the project for which we are now requesting moneys. It is an anchorage haven for small fishing boats.

Kodiak is not a rich town, but its possibilities are very favorable. As stated before, the basic economy is wholly from the products of the sea; it is only logical that we strive to lend our efforts to protect the tools, that is boats, by which fish products are extracted from the sea.

Kodiak has been incorporated only a short time. Our problems have been many, and we are trying to solve them the American way.

The city's main street is now paved. There are street lights practically throughout, and we have parking meters.

We in Kodiak, and I am sure towns through out Alaska, are grateful for the help given by Public Works. Our sewer and water system, and new schools, should be completed this year. We have a splendid electric system. These utilities are the most vital to any community.

We earnestly solicit your favorable recommendation for appropriations of moneys to start construction of a small-boat harbor, or enough moneys for complete construction of our small-boat harbor.

The estimated cost per Document No. 465, 83d Congress is $1,685,000.

CITY OF KODIAK, KODIAK, ALASKA, RESOLUTION NO. 4–55

"A resolution of the city council of the city of Kodiak, Alaska, reaffirming that local interest will provide a public landing and other facilities in the Kodiak small-boat harbor and petitioning the district engineer, division engineer, Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army to approve and support an appropriation of funds for the construction of the Kodiak small-boat harbor."

Whereas the 83d Congress of the United States has enacted, and the President of the United States approved, an omnibus river and harbor bill, which authorizes, among others, a small-boat harbor project at Kodiak, Alaska; and

Whereas it is necessary for local interests to furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will: (*a*) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including quarry rights, necessary for the initial work and for subsequent maintenance when and as required; (*b*) perform the maintenance dredging necessary to insure project depths at all times; (*c*) construct, maintain, and operate adequate mooring facilities and utilities including a public landing with suitable supply facilities, open to all on equal terms; and (*d*) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the project; and

Whereas the lack of a protected anchorage causes undue damage to fishing and other craft and retards fisheries development in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the city council, That the city of Kodiak reaffirm its previous assurance to the Secretary of the Army that the city of Kodiak will: (*a*) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including quarry rights, necessary for the initial work and for subsequent maintenance when and as required; (*b*) perform the maintenance dredging necessary to insure project depths at all times; (*c*) construct, maintain, and operate adequate mooring facilities and utilities including a public landing with suitable supply facilities, open to all on equal terms; and (*d*) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction and maintenance of the project: Be it further

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Kodiak does hereby petition the district engineer, Alaska District, United States Army, to include in the current budget estimates a request for an appropriation of funds for the construction of the Kodiak small-boat harbor; and that the division engineer, United States Army, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and the Secretary of the Army are hereby urged to approve and support a request for construction funds.

Passed by the city council of the city of Kodiak and approved by its acting mayor this 29th day of April 1955.

WILTON WHITE, *Acting Mayor.*

Attest:
[SEAL]

RICHARD G. BERG, *Clerk-Treasurer.*

SMALL BOAT BASIN, SITKA, ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Our next witness, Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Van Horn, president of the Sitka Chamber of Commerce, a man of great wisdom, as I shall demonstrate by noting that after obtaining a degree in political science from the University of Oregon he became a dairyman in Sitka instead of entering politics.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Van Horn, you may proceed.

Mr. VAN HORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a prepared statement which I will not read, because eof the pressure of time. I want to touch very briefly upon some of the things contained in this three-page statement.

Sitka is located on the west coast, 998 miles from the northern boundary. Here is a picture showing the entire Sitka Harbor as it now stands [indicating].

We are requesting funds for completion of the Corps of Engineers' project which is authorized by the 79th Congress in 1945, and at that time the estimated cost was $385,000. The cost is now $891,000, with a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.78 to 1.

Sitka, like Skagway, Kodiak, and some of the other small towns, is almost entirely dependent upon the fishing industry. We have a sawmill in Sitka but it has been closed down for the last 2 years because it could not operate at a profit. That forces us to depend almost entirely upon the fishing industry for our income.

This is a picture of the 320-foot section which broke loose last year during an easterly storm, and took 20 boats out with it, and the Coast Guard could not do very much about it, because it is a narrow channel. The fishermen did manage to save their boats; they had to cut the lines, but they had difficulty, and there was a good deal of damage suffered from it.

Since that time the floats have been restored with aid from the Territory.

This final picture is a picture during the storm, right afterwards, with all the boats in port.

As to the acreage, and the part of the storage area, there are about 3 acres; this was figured before I came there. This shows where the boats are [indicating].

We are asking for a 13-acre harbor, around on the other side of Sitka. It would accommodate up to 500 boats. Sitka has had 500 to 1,000 boats operating out of this harbor. They do come up from Ketchikan, as you have been told, but they fish immediately off the coast; Sitka is the only deepwater port on the immediate coast that can serve these vessels.

Our fresh fish pack last year was 4 million pounds. That was put up by one cold-storage plant. We have 2 canneries, 1 large and 1 small cannery, operating out of this area.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Van Horn, are these crabs pictured here caught with small fisherman boats?

Mr. VAN HORN. They range, when the halibut fleet is in, up to the large boats. Most of them in there are the small trawling boats.

Mr. EVINS. Does any deep-draft vessels come in to Sitka Harbor?

Mr. VAN HOR.N Oh, yes; steamship lines come in there.

Mr. EVINS. I just wondered whether the harbor had facilities for deep draft vessels.

Mr. VAN HORN. Yes; the harbor is 22 to 30 feet deep; the channel itself, so it will take care of ships; it runs from 20 feet on up to 7 feet near the shore.

Mr. EVINS. Where do most of the large commercial liners dock in that port?

Mr. VAN HORN. That is shown in the first picture there at a place called Conway Dock, right in the middle of the harbor. The vessels, when they are in there, block off a portion of the area, the place where the other boats, the small fishing boats, are based.

Mr. EVINS. How much funds are you requesting to repair and complete the harbor that has been damaged?

Mr. VAN HORN. We are not asking funds for repair at the harbor; the amount of $891,000, as of March 1, 1955, this year, is to dredge an area completely different from this area, around on the other side of the point.

Mr. EVINS. The portion that was destroyed at this point has been restored?

Mr. VAN HORN. That has been replaced by the city and the Territory, but we are asking to build a new one, which requires a breakwater and dredging.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there an item in the budget for this project?

Mr. VAN HORN. I do not believe so. I would just like to add that I have been a fisherman up there, myself, and have some idea what occurs when a storm is blowing in destruction of boats.

Mr. JENSEN. Have you approached the Bureau of the Budget to get their approval of this request, or their position on this request?

Mr. VAN HORN. I have not.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. The situation is this, Mr. Jensen: When the submission was made, none of these projects there was within the criteria which the Bureau of the Budget established, and these gentlemen all knew that; they came down from Alaska in order to come before you and make their appeal, because they felt the special circumstances were such that the budget could not have taken them into consideration at the time it passed on the matter.

Mr. EVINS. In other words, the criteria established by the Bureau of the Budget was so difficult that even the Corps of Engineers could not get it within the budget?

Mr. BARTLETT. They were specifically prohibited, as I understand it, from submitting any of these projects at all.

Mr. JENSEN. How much is the local interest ready and willing to spend on this project?

Mr. VAN HORN. Sitka has passed a $62,000 bond issue, which they have never exercised, because they have never had a correct start; they are ready to start the harbor.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you have a harbor charge for these fishing vessels?

Mr. VAN HORN. At the present time, no.

Mr. JENSEN. Why?

Mr. VAN HORN. We do not have a very good harbor and they just would not pay it; they would go south to other ports; that is where a lot of them spend their time.

Mr. JENSEN. They are making their living there, are they not?

Mr. VAN HORN. Some of them; yes. A large percentage of our fishermen are native fishermen, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. JENSEN. I have always taken the position that we would like to see good faith exercised by the people who are benefited by Federal appropriations before the Congress goes all out on appropriations. We take that into consideration in projects in the United States. We realize of course that Alaska is in a different category, but in our States and municipalities on the mainland, because they are different, the Congress, as a consequence, appropriates money when contributions are made.

I am not sure that it might not be well, in order to get congressional approval of this project, as well as the other projects in Alaska, that it would not be well to tell the people that they should do whatever they can with their own funds. Now, maybe that is not good smart politics for me to point that out, but I think it is good business and good advice.

Mr. VAN HORN. May I ask you a question, Mr. Jensen?

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly.

Mr. VAN HORN. You mean to say that we should start working on this harbor with our own money?

Mr. JENSEN. You should show good faith by an appropriation, or by expenditure, financed by your own people, in order to prove to the Members of Congress that you have done as much as you can for yourselves.

I think Mr. Bartlett will tell you that makes a pretty good case in the eyes of the Congress when a people, regardless of what political subdivision they are in, in the United States or Alaska, if the people are inclined to want things bad enough to spend their own dollars for the things for which they are asking the Congress to appropriate money; it shows good faith.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I just add something there, Mr. Jensen?

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to say that these Alaska projects are authorized in exactly the same way, as I understand it, as every other project in the United States, and the Corps of Engineers decides on certain costs for the local community. And every community in Alaska is prepared to assume its burden of the local cost when it is decided to go ahead with the project.

Mr. JENSEN. Are you talking now about municipal improvements or are you talking about all programs?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am talking about these specific projects, rivers and harbors.

Mr. JENSEN. Harbor projects?

Mr. BARTLETT. Harbor projects; yes.

Incidentally, I might say, on another subject, Mr. Jensen, that the gas tax was raised to 5 cents.

Mr. JENSEN. I think that was smart. I think the Congress, as you recall, appropriates money for roads in Alaska, even more liberally than we have for other areas, and I think you have done a pretty good thing.

Mr. BARTLETT. The increase was substantial; of that there is no doubt.

Mr. JENSEN. I went to Alaska in 1945, and of course there is a difference between the Territory there now and then; but I am, of course, interested, very deeply interested, and I know there have been a great many changes.

I am not saying, of course, that I would oppose the harbor improvement at this point at all, and I think I have proven, beyond a question of doubt, that there is a warm spot in my heart for Alaska. I have helped to appropriate many hundreds of millions of dollars for Alaska in the past—many hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. BARTLETT. And I am happy to acknowledge that.

Mr. HAND. What is the estimated cost of building this new harbor?

Mr. VAN HORN. $891,000.

Mr. HAND. $891,000. What is the present population of Sitka?

Mr. VAN HORN. 4,000.

Mr. HAND. 4,000.

Mr. VAN HORN. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. I want to add one further statement.

I want to say that while the Bureau of the Budget has not approved funds for the projects requested, it has been testified here by Delegate Bartlett and others, and Mr. Van Horn, who is now testifying, that

when the storm there destroyed the vessels and the local harbor, that the local people and the Territory and government, rebuilt and repaired it, using their own funds for that purpose and no funds are requested for that.

I think they have demonstrated a capacity to do work of this nature, and it is the essence of democracy that these people should come to Washington before the Appropriations Committee and ask for funds for these great developments, even though the Bureau of the Budget has seen fit not to approve them.

I think they have demonstrated their local initiative and their capacity to do things on their own at the local government level. I think it is certainly proper and appropriate for them to come before the Appropriations Committee and express their views.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS AND HARBOR PROJECTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

WITNESS

HON. (MRS.) JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, A DELEGATE IN CONGRESS FROM THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. EVINS. Our next witness is our colleague from Hawaii, Mrs. Farrington.

We will be pleased to hear you, Mrs. Farrington.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Mr. EVINS. You are a very fine Delegate and you succeeded a very fine Delegate.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. I want to thank you for this opportunity to be heard this morning.

I have two statements that I would like to make in support of certain items pertaining to the budget for Hawaii.

The first statement will be in regard to the investigation program in the Territory of Hawaii, which comes under the general investigative activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, and my second statement will be in support of budget items for harbor projects.

INVESTIGATION

In regard to the investigation program in the Territory of Hawaii—for fiscal year 1956 the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior has requested an appropriation of $5,175,000 for the general investigation activity. Included in this request is $50,000 for the Hawaiian investigation program to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to furnish technical assistance in the planning of the Molokai and Waimea projects on the islands and to review reports thereon.

This planning program is in accordance with Public Law 634 passed by the last session of Congress which authorized the Secretary of the Interior "to make an investigation relating to the conservation,

development, and utilization of the irrigation and reclamation resources of the Waimanalo, Oahu; Waimea, island of Hawaii; and Molokai projects, Territory of Hawaii * * *." The construction of the Waimanalo project is now complete except for possibly some rehabilitation work which the agencies of the Territorial government are capable of undertaking without assistance, so the activities of the Bureau in fiscal year 1956 will be confined to the Waimea and Molokai projects.

There is no doubt that there is a great need for additional irrigation development in the Territory of Hawaii. The islands present a great contrast in rainfall and available water supplies. As a result of the combination of the prevailing northeast trade winds and topographic features, some locales have unusually heavy precipitation while others, often only a few miles away, have such scanty supplies as to be classified as semiarid. Heavy rains usually occur at the higher altitudes in the mountainous regions while the fertile valleys in the interior and the coastal lands on the south and west are inadequately watered. As an example, in the mountains behind the city of Honolulu there is an annual rainfall up to 160 inches while at the seashore, 5.5 miles from this area of heavy precipitation, the annual rainfall is only 15 inches. The inadequate rainfall in most of the agricultural areas of the Territory requires the lands to be irrigated in order to support successful crops.

Agriculture is the primary industry in the islands and irrigation is practiced rather extensively. The Territory does not produce sufficient foodstuffs and other necessary agricultural products to meet its own requirements, however, and importation of food is, therefore, a necessity. This situation is attributable to population increase and limited additional farming opportunities which have resulted in a demand for new lands to be tilled. This condition could be alleviated by the proper development of existing land and water resources. There is a large quantity of arable, water-deficient land available which, if adequately watered, would assist in meeting these land demands. It is a question of getting the water and land together.

Of particular concern at the moment are funds for the Bureau of Reclamation to assist in the completion of the plans for the Molokai project. This project has been investigated intermittently for many years including a study by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1938. Following completion of the latter study, the Territory established the Molokai Water Board and authorized a bond issue of $2,500,000 for construction of the project with the expectation of obtaining Federal funds in a like amount. Although a subsequent request to Congress for Federal funds to assist in the construction was not granted, the original bond issue authorization is still available. The Territory will need some Federal assistance in construction of the project. But before seeking such assistance the various plans and proposals must be firmed up. It is contemplated that this will be done in fiscal year 1956 if adequate investigation funds are made available to the Bureau of Reclamation.

I strongly urge that sufficient investigation funds be provided to the Bureau so that our investigations among others may proceed.

I have made this statement in support of items already in the budget.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mrs. Farrington, for your very fine and eloquent statement.

HARBOR PROJECTS

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Now, my next statement is in regard to harbor projects.

Mr. HAND. Before you leave reclamation, Mrs. Farrington, I would like to ask you a question, if I may.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Yes.

Mr. HAND. Is it your position, Mrs. Farrington, that the Territory of Hawaii is sufficiently suited for the purpose of an all-agriculture economy, in addition to your present specialized economy?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Oh, yes; it is a beautiful island and this particular project is located, and has sufficient acres, where it could produce enough food for the entire Territory.

Mr. HAND. It is suitable for all crops?

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Yes. Vegetables, pineapples, and others.

Mr. HAND. Thank you very much.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the harbor projects:

I am appearing before your committee to support the requests contained in the President's budget covering maintenance and construction of existing structures in the Territory of Hawaii. I am informed that under this category are carried funds for repairs to breakwaters. The budget carries the following amounts:

Kahului Harbor	$520,000
Nawiliwili Harbor	160,000
Hilo Harbor	60,000

In addition to the amounts allocated for maintenance and construction and repairs to breakwaters there has been a tentative allocation of $270,000 for dredging operations in harbors at Honolulu, Kaunakakai, Nawiliwili, Port Allen, and Kahului. This makes a total of $1,010,000 for projects of this character in the Territory.

I have been informed that practically no Federal funds for harbor improvements and maintenance dredging have been provided for the past 15 years and there is a definite need for dredging operations in the harbors. For instance, ships using Nawiliwili Harbor have a draft of between 29 and 30 feet maximum after loading bulk sugar. Shoal spots are reported in the harbor at 29 and 30 feet which make it increasingly difficult to load ships to capacity because of the shallow spots at the entrance to the harbor. On the island of Maui is Kahului Harbor, and a study has been authorized into the advisability of enlarging the turning basin in this harbor to accommodate larger ships. This project has not yet been authorized. In the meantime, however, it is essential that the present harbor be dredged.

Honolulu Harbor is the largest harbor in the Territory through which most of the shipping passes, and it is extremely important that this harbor be kept in the best possible condition.

Under the item for maintenance and construction, as stated above, a provision is made for repairs to breakwaters at our principal harbors. In a severe storm last year the breakwaters at Hilo, Kahului, and Nawiliwili were badly damaged. The United States Army Engineers have surveyed the extent of damage and recommend immediate repairs to prevent further deterioration. There will undoubtedly be heavy storms around the end of this year and because of the weakened condition of the present breakwaters damage might be very extensive and repairs would be more costly. I am told that if the repairs are

not made, it might result in some of the freighters being unable to enter these ports.

In the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which was passed in the 83d Congress, authorization was given for the construction of the following harbor projects:

Honolulu Harbor, second entrance	$3,022,000
Nawiliwili and Port Allen Harbors	1,166,400

In addition to the two projects authorized in the last Congress, the improvement of Kawaihae Harbor on the island of Hawaii was authorized in 1950 at a cost in Federal funds of $6,020,000. Funds in the amount of $50,000 have been appropriated for planning on this project.

No funds for the above three projects have been requested in the budget. However, I want to urge that very careful consideration be given to these projects.

The harbor at Kawaihae is particularly important for the sugar industry on the island of Hawaii. There is only one other harbor on this island, at Hilo, and Kawaihae would serve the other side of the island. At present it is necessary to transport sugar by truck to Hilo Harbor at considerable expense. The improvements at Kawaihae Harbor would serve a great agricultural community. Inasfar as funds in the amount of $50,000 for plans for this project have already been appropriated, and I understand the plans will be completed this year, construction can proceed immediately on proper appropriation.

The Territorial Board of Harbor Commissioners is constructing an entrance channel and a barge basin at Kawaihae in accordance with its own plans and at its own expense under a Department of the Army permit. The Harbor Board's project when completed will be consonant with the proposed Federal harbor improvement.

The improvement to Nawiliwili Harbor was authorized in the last Congress at a cost of $1,210,000. No funds have been appropriated as yet for preparation of plans and specifications.

In addition to the three harbor projects which have been authorized, the following projects have been authorized but are not included in the budget this year.

Shore protection, Waikiki Beach	$292,000
Hanapepe River, Kauai, flood control	337,000
Kawainui Swamp, Oahu, flood control	951,000
Wailoa Stream, Hawaii, diversion and channel improvement	358,000

That makes a total of $1,938,000 right there.

I do think this is a very reasonable request to come here and ask support for these items which are in the present budget of some $1,010,000 when we have these other very large projects of nearly $12 million that are not in the budget. The items we are asking for today are all in the budget.

I am drawing your attention to the other items in the hope that we will receive consideration for them, and that you may be able to allow us the money for them.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, Mrs. Farrington; and you have made your position quite clear.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Thank you.

Mr. JENSEN. I just want to say, Mrs. Farrington, it is a pleasure for me to see you up here before the committee and making your statement in such clear terms. As you know, I have taken a great deal of

interest in Hawaii as in the other Territories. I have visited the great Territory of Hawaii, as you know.

I can only say that your request has been well presented.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mrs. Farrington.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955.

FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER RESOURCES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

WITNESSES

HON. CARL HINSHAW, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. JAMES B. UTT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. CHARLES, M. TEAGUE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. CLAIR ENGLE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CLAIR A. HILL, VICE CHAIRMAN, STATE WATER RESOURCES BOARD

H. E. HEDGER, CHIEF ENGINEER, LOS ANGELES COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

JOHN BRYANT, COUNTY ENGINEER, RIVERSIDE COUNTY

WILLIS H. WARNER, CHAIRMAN, ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

J. A. WOOLLEY, CONSULTING ENGINEER

HARRY E. LLOYD, MANAGER AND CHIEF ENGINEER, HETCH HETCHY WATER SUPPLY

A. M. CROWELL, PRESIDENT, TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT

MILTON KIDD, DIRECTOR, MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

CHARLES W. DETERDING, COUNTY EXECUTIVE, SACRAMENTO COUNTY

JOHN M. LUTHER, MANAGER, CALIFORNIA CENTRAL VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION

DOUGLAS B. COHEN, MEMBER, STATE RECLAMATION BOARD

GEORGE LODI, MEMBER, STATE RECLAMATION BOARD

W. A. ALEXANDER, ENGINEER-MANAGER, LOWER TULE RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

RAY WILLIAMS, LOWER TULE RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

KENT D. PURSEL, CHAIRMAN, ALAMEDA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CHESTER E. STANLEY, ALAMEDA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

GUILFORD KOCH, OAKLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. EVINS. We are privileged to have with us our esteemed and distinguished colleague, Congressman Carl Hinshaw. His efforts on behalf of flood control and water resources in California are well known to all of us. Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. HINSHAW. Thank you. I would merely like, Mr. Chairman, to present these people to you and to say they will make a presentation that is worthwhile. I also want to say that you can learn more about these projects if you visit our fair State. Each of the 30 members of the delegation support the statements that will be made.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Congressman Hinshaw.

The Subcommittee on Public Works for the Western Section will hear Mr. Clair A. Hill, vice chairman of the State water resources board, and Mr. Sam R. Leedom, administrative assistant of the State water resources board, and those witnesses they will present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I am Clair A. Hill, vice chairman of the State water resources board, and I am accompanied by Mr. Sam R. Leedom, administrative assistant of the State water resources board, and Northcutt Ely, our special counsel in Washington.

I have a prepared statement I should like to file for the record.

Mr. EVINS. Very well.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF CLAIR A. HILL, VICE CHAIRMAN, STATE WATER RESOURCES BOARD

Chairman Evins and members of the committee, I am Clair H. Hill, of Redding, Calif., vice chairman of the State Water Resources Board of California. For the past 7 years, the chairman of our board has been appearing before this committe in behalf of the State, and as spokesman for the representatives of the California Flood Control Conference, who bring you the detailed information on the varied flood-control projects we are here to discuss.

Unfortunately, our chairman, Mr. C. A. Griffith, of Azusa, is unable to be here today. In his absence I would like to point out that the State water resources board is appointed by, and speaks officially for the Governor of California with regard to flood-control matters. This year, I am pleased to report we come before you with a request for flood-control appropriations which is substantially reduced below that of previous years.

This reduction has been made possible only because the Appropriations Committees of the Congress have recognized the magnitude of our flood-control problems in California and have allocated large sums of Federal moneys to meet these needs from year to year. It is true that at times we have been impatient. The State water resources board and the various agencies in California concerned with flood-control matters, frequently have deplored the snaillike progress of the Federal Government in getting its authorized flood-control program completed.

However, taking my own State as an example, I feel we have made great progress in the construction of flood-control works since the Federal Government resumed major responsibility for such works in the omnibus bill of 1944. Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River and Isabella Dam on the Kern River have been completed and are now functioning as a great flood-control and water-conservation projects. With this year's appropriations as recommended in the President's budget, Folsom Dam on the American River, Cherry Valley Dam on a tributary of the Tuolumne River, and San Antonio and Whittier Narrows Dams in southern California will be completed. Those dams and reservoirs are milestones of progress built in steel and concrete on the road to final and complete protection for the people of our State from the terrible hazards of floodwaters. However, we are still far from the end of the road.

California's flood-control problems, unlike many other States are multiple. We do not come here simply seeking 1 levee, 1 flood wall, 1 flood-control dam, but a combination of all of them to fit our complex needs. California, in land area, is the second largest State in the Union. Of its 158,295 square miles,

two-thirds are mountainous and foothill lands, and the other third, valley and mesa lands. Our terrain contains the greatest extremes to be found in the United States. It ranges from the Nation's high point at the peak of Mount Whitney, 14,496 feet above sea level, to its lowest point at Badwater in Death Valley, 280 feet below sea level. We have the second longest coastline in the Nation. On the eastern seaboard it would extend from Cape Cod to Charleston, S. C. On the gulf coast it would reach from Brownsville, Tex., on the Mexican Border, to Cape St. George, Fla. and in the Mississippi Basin our State would extend from Chicago to New Orleans.

Our climate ranges from subzero temperatures to the extremes of desert heat; the annual rainfall from a maximum of 134.92 inches in the north coastal area to a mean of 1.7 inches in the desert regions. Snowfall, as actually measured by the snow survey crews on one of our State courses, has reached depths of over 300 inches with a water content of 150.7 inches.

Last year we pointed out the inherent dangers in long-delayed flood-control works in the south coastal basin of California. Brush fires in that very precipitous area, directly back of the city of Los Angeles, made emergency flood-control works immediately necessary. This year we are confronted with an almost identical situation on the watershed above the city of San Bernardino. By air these areas are only a few miles apart. The topography is almost identical.

Last fall, extensive forest fires on the precipitous watershed above the city of San Bernardino created an emergency situation which must be dealt with at once. When the board's recommendations for flood-control appropriations were made last summer, they were based upon a long-range program. The devastating fires of last fall have changed that picture entirely and the board supports the emergency appropriations being sought by that city and county.

For the State as a whole, and this includes 25 federally authorized flood-control projects, we are recommending appropriations of only $43¼ million. This includes a request of $500,000 which would be used by the South Pacific division of the Corps of Engineers for preliminary examination and surveys to which I shall refer later.

This request represents approximately one-tenth of the estimated amount required to complete the presently authorized Federal flood-control projects in California. We feel it is modest in view of our needs, which we have stressed repeatedly in former appearances before this committee.

Despite its repetitiousness the fact remains today as it did last year and the year before that, and the year before that, going clear back to 1940, that we are confronted in California with a population increase that exceeds anything in the history of our Nation.

Put yourself in our position. As of this date we have a population of somewhere between 12 and 13 million people. It changes so rapidly only approximations can be made. For instance, statistics show that since I started this talk the State has gained another 20 in population. At this rate of increase it adds up to about 6,900 people a week or nearly 370,000 people a year—give or take a few thousand.

In Michigan this growth would mean that we would have to provide the homes, public utilities, schools, hospitals, jails, and so forth for the entire population of the two great cities of Flint and Grand Rapids. In Minnesota it would mean building a city the size of St. Paul. In Oregon we would have to provide the present facilities of the city of Portland. In Pennsylvania it would mean building a city half the size of Pittsburgh.

As States go we are gaining in population each year at the rate of about the present population of Vermont, twice as many people as now reside in Nevada and more people each year than now reside in either Delaware or Wyoming.

As you gentlemen are well aware, great or even small increases in population encroach upon natural flood-control channels. We create new problems almost as fast as we solve the old.

I think California is doing a magnificient job in coping with the problems confronting it. Insofar as I know we are one of the few, if not the only State in the Union, which has guaranteed through State appropriations to underwrite the cost of local cooperation required by the Federal Government.

Therefore, I again say that the requested appropriations we are seeking are extremely modest. We are in fact requesting less for the entire State than the appropriations which this committee has authorized at various times for a single project in the Northwest and Middle West.

We are particularly concerned this year about those authorized projects for which no planning funds have been provided in the President's budget. Without adequate planning funds we have found in the past that projects come up for construction on estimates which do not give either this committee or the State of California a true picture of the final cost of the project. We have a large number of authorized projects for which planning funds are requested.

Being an engineer by profession I am well acquainted with problems which arise in actually getting a project under way. From a purely engineering standpoint I know that it takes about 2 years to bring your planning for even a relatively minor project up to the definite planning stage. Therefore, we believe that without these planning funds the Federal flood-control program will come to a standstill. The Congress has assumed flood protection works as a Federal responsibility. For that reason we urge that you appropriate the planning funds necessary to carry out the Federal obligation. If the Congress has decided that flood control is no longer a Federal responsibility, we should be so advised in order that the States and local subdivisions may step into the program where the Federal Government has left off.

In addition, we are particularly alarmed with the virtual elimination of funds for preliminary examinations and surveys. Without these funds, many worthwhile and needed projects cannot even be brought to the point where the authorizing committees can competently act upon them. We therefore urge that you give particular attention to this item.

The program adopted by the board is divided into these categories—construction funds, planning funds, and preliminary examination and survey funds, as follows:

Los Angeles engineering district:		
Construction funds:		
Los Angeles County drainage area	$24,215,000	
Whittier Narrows Dam	933,000	
San Antonio Dam	530,000	
San Antonio Channel	790,000	
	26,468,000	
Advance planning funds:		
Bautista and San Jacinto levees	100,000	
Carbon Canyon Dam	125,000	
Riverside levees	100,000	
Santa Clara River and Santa Paula Creek	120,000	
Warm, East Twin, Devil, and Lytle Creeks	100,000	
Stewart Canyon Dam	26,000	
	571,000	
Total Los Angeles engineering district		$27,039,000
Sacramento engineering district:		
Construction funds:		
American River levees	$300,000	
Cherry Valley Dam	785,000	
Folsom Dam	4,150,000	
Sacramento River, old project	5,000,000	
Sacramento River, major and minor tributaries	2,000,000	
San Joaquin River levees	1,000,000	
Success Dam	1,000,000	
	14,235,000	
Advance planning funds:		
Black Butte Dam	100,000	
New Hogan Dam	225,000	
New Melones Dam	200,000	
Terminus Dam	150,000	
Middle Creek	75,000	
	750,000	
Total Sacramento engineering district		14,985,000

San Francisco engineering district:		
Construction funds:		
Russian River project	$1,000,000	
Advance planning funds:		
San Lorenzo Creek	100,000	
San Lorenzo River	100,000	
	200,000	
Total, San Francisco engineering district		$1,200,000
South Pacific division:		
Preliminary examinations and surveys		500,000
Grand total		43,724,000

And now in closing, I would like to add that in view of the fact this is the first time we have had an opportunity to present our California problems to the newly organized Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I hope that we will be able to provide you with all of the detail necessary for your deliberations. Our program is statewide.

Since the organization of the State Water Resources Board, we have made every effort to see that all of the flood-control projects in California are presented at one time so the committee is not faced with the necessity of hearing a delegation devoted exclusively to a given project one day, and a few days later have to repeat the process on another project. The Governor of California and all interested flood-control agencies in our State support this single program. I hope it loses none of its effectiveness because it is presented on a statewide basis. I thank you.

Mr. HILL. The State Water Resources Board is appointed by the Governor and speaks officially for the Governor of California with regard to flood-control matters.

California, which is the second largest State in the Union in land area and population, has very serious flood-control problems. Of its 158,000 square miles of area, two-thirds are mountainous and foothill lands, and our terrain contains the greatest extremes to be found in the United States. It ranges from the highest altitude to the lowest altitude in the country. That adds to our problem.

Last year we pointed out to this committee the danger of delay in our flood-control projects. At that time we were faced with a very serious emergency situation in the mountains back of the city of Los Angeles due to a series of disastrous fires which burned off all of the brush and timber on the watershed directly above that city which required emergency funds to correct.

This year we are confronted with a similar situation on the watershed above the city of San Bernardino, where a series of fires last fall completely devastated that area. Any heavy storm in that area could create a very serious situation. I believe this has already been presented to your committee. No emergency funds were included in our original request for appropriations which was made on the basis of an orderly long-range program, but we do support the request of the people from San Bernardino for emergency funds. Also, in the board's program, we have an item of $500,000 for a preliminary examination and survey money. This, we feel, is extremely important because there are many deserving projects on which there is no planning even of a preliminary nature. Unless adequate planning funds are provided these projects will not be ready for this committee's consideration nor for the State's consideration.

In California under the law the State guarantees the cost of local participation required by Federal flood-control laws. As far as I

know it is the only State in the Union that does guarantee the matching funds, and those funds are in our State budget annually.

The program adopted by the board is divided into construction, planning, and preliminary examination and survey funds, and I have a list on page 8 of my statement which itemizes them.

It starts with the Los Angeles Engineering District. The first item in that district is the Los Angeles County drainage area, for which the request is $24,215,000.

The next item is the Whittier Narrows Dam, which requires $933,000 to complete the project.

The next item is the San Antonio Dam, which requires $530,000 to complete the project.

And the San Antonio Channel requires $790,000.

The total construction funds requested for the Los Angeles Engineering District is $26,468,000. In addition to this there is a request for advance planning funds on the following authorized projects in that district:

Bautista and San Jacinto levees, $100,000; Carbon Canyon Dam, $125,000; Riverside levees, $100,000; Santa Clara River and Santa Paula Creek, $120,000; Warm, East Twin, Devil, and Lytle Creeks, $100,000; and this is the one I referred to Congressman Sheppard, and Mr. Break, chairman of the board of supervisors of San Bernardino appeared before this committee requesting emergency funds.

Mr. EVINS. Will you please indicate those that differ from the amounts carried in the budget?

Mr. HILL. I am sorry. I cannot do that.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed.

Mr. HILL. The total requested for the Los Angeles Engineering District in construction funds and advance planning funds is $27,039,000.

In the Sacramento Engineering District construction funds are being requested for the following projects:

American River levees, $300,000; Cherry Valley Dam, $785,000——

Mr. HILL. The only one I would like to refer to is the last one under the South Pacific division, preliminary examinations and surveys, $500,000.

Mr. EVINS. The grand total of $43,724,000 is for all over the State of California?

Mr. HILL. Yes. Since the organization of the State water resources board we have made every effort to organize the California people so that only one hearing would be necessary, and we hope that in that way even though many projects are listed, it will not lose its effectiveness.

I would like at this time to introduce Col. H. E. Hedger, chief engineer, representing the Los Angeles County Flood Control District.

Mr. EVINS. We will be very glad to hear from you, Colonel Hedger.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

Mr. HEDGER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is H. E. Hedger. I am chief engineer of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. I have a statement I would like to submit for the record.

Mr. EVINS. Very well.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF H. E. HEDGER, CHIEF ENGINEER, LOS ANGELES COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my name is H. E. Hedger, and, as chief engineer of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, I have been directed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors to report the flood-control needs of the Los Angeles County drainage area for fiscal 1956 to your committee.

In past years I have appeared before this committee to report these needs and have described the special climatic and geographic conditions that make Los Angeles one of the critical flood hazard areas in the United States. For the benefit of new committee members, and to refresh the memories of those who have previously served, it might be well to again set forth these conditions.

The heavily populated coastal valleys and plains of Los Angeles are bordered by a precipitous range of mountains which rises to a height of 10,000 feet within a few miles of the coast. During most of the year little rain falls in this area, so that the river and stream beds coursing down the slopes of the mountains and leading out across the plains to the sea are dry and harmless appearing.

In the late fall and winter months this picture can change with drastic and, at times, tragic suddenness. Intense storms rising in the Pacific Ocean sweep in across the coastal plains, bringing rainfall in such quantities that the once-dry stream beds become raging torrents of debris-filled water.

Storms of this type, occurring on an average of once in every 4 years, have claimed many lives and caused damages of millions of dollars to property.

Los Angeles County first began its efforts to control floodwaters in 1915, and in 1936 the Federal Government extended badly needed help when it authorized construction of flood-control reservoirs, channels, and debris basins in the Los Angeles County drainage area. These structures are the only effective means of providing protection to the lives and property of our citizens from the ever-present threat of a disastrous flood.

In recent years the tremendous expansion in population and industrial construction has increased the urgency of our flood-control needs. New homes are crowding against unprotected streambanks, and factories, many of them engaged in national defense production, now are standing in areas which overnight can revert to marshlands and lakes many acres in extent.

In the decade 1940–50, Los Angeles County population increased by 1,366,044 persons and added another 633,313 in the period 1950–54. The rate of increase continues at more than 168,000 yearly, and by 1960 some 5,625,000 persons are expected to be making their homes in this county.

According to United States Department of Commerce figures, the value added by manufacture in Los Angeles increased 296.5 percent in the years 1939–47, and from 1947 to 1953 another increase of 125.2 percent was recorded here. At the present time this county is the Nation's leading manufacturer of aircraft and aircraft parts. Obviously, any interruption in production of these basic industries could have extremely serious consequences in this Nation's preparations for defense.

Unfortunately, flood-protective measures have not kept pace with this region's growth in population and in importance as a manufacturing, transportation, and defense-production center. It is imperative that flood-control construction be stepped up to prevent the recurrence of destructive floods which now, more than ever, would have nationwide consequences.

The State water resources board in its description of the flood-control needs for the entire State has listed the projects in Los Angeles County which the board believes merit immediate attention. These projects will require the following appropriations:

Los Angeles County drainage area project	$24,215,000
Whittier Narrows flood-control basin	933,000
Santa Ana River basin project	1,335,000

The State's recommendation for the Los Angeles drainage area project is based on the necessity for construction of the following units of this project:

Continuing contracts to be completed:	
Los Angeles River, 20th St. to Willow St	$1,227,000
Los Angeles River, Willow St. to Carson St	5,235,000
Los Angeles River, P. E. RR. bridge (Cerritos trestle) and appurtenant channel	2,481,000
Los Angeles River, Compton Blvd. to P. E. RR. (Santa Ana Line)	3,016,000
Rio Hondo, Washington Blvd. to Whittier Narrows flood-control basin	2,912,000
Eaton Wash, Rio Hondo to Encinitas Ave	2,090,000
Arcadia Wash, Rio Hondo to East Branch	2,169,000
Sawpit Wash, Duarte Road to debris basin	1,570,000
Continuing contracts to be awarded:	
Los Angeles River, Atlantic Ave. to Compton Blvd	200,000
Los Angeles River, Dayton Ave. to Victory Blvd., permanent channel invert	350,000
Los Angeles River, Reseda Blvd. to Corbin Ave	300,000
Rio Hondo, Whittier Narrows to Lower Azusa Rd	400,000
Eaton Wash, Encinitas Ave. to Huntington Dr	150,000
Arcadia Wash, East Branch and Lima St. lateral to Colorado Blvd	280,000
Burbank Western System (upper), Burbank Blvd. to above Scott Rd. and Stough Channel and debris basin	300,000
Centinela Creek, Ballona Creek to Florence Ave	300,000
Sawtelle-Westwood System, Sepulveda Channel, Charnock Rd. to National Blvd	180,000
Planning	1,055,000
Subtotal	24,215,000

Following the State's action, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted the State recommendations as its official program of urgent flood-control needs in this county. It is with gratification that we find the major portion of this program has been recommended for appropriations in the administration's budget for the next fiscal year.

We are indeed pleased that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended continuation of work on the Los Angeles River from 20th Street to Wardlow Road and start of construction from Wardlow to the Santa Ana line of the Pacific Electric Railroad, as well as the improvement of the river from Reseda Avenue to Corbin Avenue in the San Fernando Valley.

The inclusion of funds to complete the Whittier Narrows and San Antonio flood-control basins so that these key structures can be placed in operation this year is a matter of the greatest satisfaction to us. We are also pleased to note that the budget is in substantial accord with local recommendations for improvement of initial units of San Antonio Channel, Sawpit and Arcadia Washes, and of the Rio Hondo upstream to the junction with Arcadia Wash.

It is deeply regretted, however, that the administration's budget does not contain funds to continue the vitally needed work on Eaton Wash, which now constitutes an extreme hazard to one of the most populous districts of the San Gabriel Valley. Equally urgent is the need for renewing construction of the Sawtelle-Westwood Channel and the improvement of Centinela Creek to alleviate the annual flooding of homes, factories, and major throughfares along these watercourses.

The area subject to overflow from the Sawtelle-Westwood and Centinela Creek Channels is nearing complete development. It now has a population of more than 16,000 people, most of whom are employed in defense industry, and is crossed by 6 traffic arteries, including 2 State highways. Property subject to flooding in this district alone is valued at $116 million. Some 40 factories, among them the Hughes and Douglas aircraft assembly plants, are located in the flood-hazard area created by these unimproved channels.

In much the same category of acutely needed flood-control construction is the Burbank-Western Channel, which flows through the densely settled city of Burbank and crosses the United States Highway 99 and the Southern Pacific Railroad near the Lockheed Air Terminal before emptying into the Los Angeles River.

Because of the urgency of the need to control these unimproved channels, the further consideration by the committee is requested with the hope that they can be included in the next year's construction program.

In asking for an expanded program beyond the recommendations of the administration, the district also is committing itself to greater expenditures. As you are aware, right-of-way acquisition and bridge-construction costs for Federal work are borne by the district. The financial cooperation required of the district by the Federal program as recommended by the President for the next fiscal year alone amounts to $3,067,600.

In addition, the district's budget contains funds for acquisition of right-of-way for Federal projects still in the planning stages, as well as carryover funds heretofore committed but not yet expended, so that the total amount encumbered for right-of-way acquisition and highway-bridge construction in connection with the Federal program is $14,805,200.

Other sums included in the planned expenditures for 1955–56 include $5,822,935 for maintaining and operation of completed dams, debris basins, and channels, and $10,339,156 for flood-control work outside the Federal program. It can be seen, then, that the total district budget as submitted to the board of supervisors to continue flood-control construction and maintenance in Los Angeles County for 1955–56 reaches nearly $31 million, or close to double the amount of recommended Federal expenditures for the same period.

In addition to these rather considerable sums, another $36 million will be spent by the district in the construction of storm drains, most of which are tributary to the federally authorized system of channels and dams. Many of these storm drains cannot be built until the Federal projects into which they discharge surface storm waters are constructed. It should be noted that the entire storm-drain construction program is being financed locally with funds from an $179-million bond issue approved by county voters in 1952 for this purpose.

The expenditure of such great sums for flood control, approved both by the people of this county in direct bond elections and by their representatives in local government, is clear testimony to the need that is felt here for providing this kind of protection and to the willingness of our citizens to bear a major portion of the costs.

It is our strong belief that Los Angeles' position as a center of commerce and industry for the entire West and its rapidly growing importance to the national economy and to the Nation's defense provides ample justification for expediting the flood-control program so that it may be completed within the next 10 years. To accomplish this objective it will be necessary to increase annual appropriations made by Congress to not less than $20 million. We have no hesitancy in urging this committee to adopt such a policy, feeling that it is essential for the protection of lives and property in this county and for the preservation of a substantial part of this country's economy.

We appreciate the opportunity to present this report to the committee and the consideration the members of the committee have given to our flood-control needs.

Mr. HEDGER. I am here by direction of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, who are also the supervisors in charge of the flood-control district.

I would like to talk about three projects in Los Angeles County.

The largest of the three projects is known as the Los Angeles County drainage project, and we think that it is one of the greatest hazards in the country as of this time although it is rapidly being brought under control through the valuable help the Congress is giving us through the Corps of Engineers.

This project was originally authorized under the flood-control omnibus bill of 1936. It was one of the largest authorized at that time. I have had the assignment of coming back and discussing the matter with the congressional committees almost every year since then, and it is a pleasure occasionally to find we have new committees to deal with. It gives us a chance to make new friends we did not have before.

I hope the members of this committee will have an opportunity, as Congressman Hinshaw suggested, to visit our State. It has been almost 2 years since the committee made a visit with Mr. Sanders, and I think it was helpful all around.

To assist in following the testimony I have some topographic maps that I would like the committee to have. The highest point on the

map, at the right-hand side, is at an elevation of 10,000 feet and is located about 40 miles from the ocean. The very steep mountainous condition produces flash runoffs that are devastating. They develop and are over in a matter of hours, but in that time considerable loss of life and property damage occur. In 1948 in a few hours nearly 50 lives were lost and $40 million damage done through that source.

The county now has reached the point it has a population of over 5 million. It is one of the leading industrial areas of the country. A great many of the defense industries are located there and are subject to the same flood hazards as the people who live there.

As I mentioned we have been working on this with the Federal Government since 1936, and to date we are approximately one-half through with the program. We would not have nearly the loss of life today that we had in 1938 from a similar flood, but the problem is still one of great magnitude and must be solved as soon as possible.

Our district is the local agency responsible to the Government for local costs. We work with the district engineers to determine which of the items are of the greatest importance. We have presented on pages 2 and 3 of my statement and have in the black lines on the relief map the currently needed units of the Los Angeles drainage area project. This program involves $24 million for the Los Angeles drainage area project. The budget recommendation for that item is $14 million. However, the budget recommendation lists every item on pages 2 and 3 except four: Eaton Wash from Encinitas Avenue to Huntington Drive; the Burbank western system; Centinela Creek; and the Sawtelle-Westwood system. We feel they are urgent. However, we feel that $15 million or a little more than that is all the Corps of Engineers can put under contract next year, and we know it is the policy of your committee to appropriate only the money that can be used in a given year. So we are not suggesting a large increase in the appropriation, but we are suggesting that the Corps of Engineers be given a flexible program by not requiring them to be restricted to specific projects but permitting them to work on any of the projects on the list.

So, with the program that we have jointly developed showing that the need is far greater than the $14 million budget recommendation, we feel the best use of the money appropriated can be made if you authorize them to work on the main channels and tributaries listed here instead of restricting them solely to the units listed in the budget.

We come to this committee with the feeling that we are carrying our full load in this program. The flood-control district was first placed in effect in 1917 and since that time has raised and expended something in the order of $140 million of its own taxpayers' money on flood-control work. That is in addition to the appropriations of Congress. Our district budget this year is in the order of $30 million to maintain projects completed by the Corps of Engineers and turned over to us, and to do all that is necessary to carry out the local responsibilities of the corps' program, as well as projects not in the corps' program.

The district each year since the war has expended more funds on flood-control work in Los Angeles County than the Corps of Engineers has with Federal appropriations.

We are subject to a 15 cents tax limit, which raises annually about $8 million or $10 million in our county. We have in addition the

reimbursement from the State which permits us to carry such a heavy load, and we intend to go on with that year after year.

Mr. HAND. Do you have a tax limitation under your law?

Mr. HEDGER. Yes.

Mr. HAND. What is it?

Mr. HEDGER. Fifteen cents.

Mr. HAND. On a hundred?

Mr. HEDGER. Yes.

Mr. HAND. And are you raising the maximum?

Mr. HEDGER. Yes. The board of supervisors has levied the maximum every year for years.

Mr. HAND. The maximum under the law?

Mr. HEDGER. Yes. In addition it can issue bonds.

This program on this map is the backbone of the drainage system for Los Angeles County. There are countless channels that feed into those. In 1952 the electorate of our district authorized a bond issue of $179 million, for these supplemental flood-control works. Expenditures for that program average $40 million a year in addition to the annual budget. So you might say this year the Los Angeles County Flood Control District will expend about $70 million on flood-control work in our county. The $14 million budget recommendation that the committee is considering will help tremendously in carrying on that program.

WHITTIER NARROWS DAM AND SAN ANTONIO DAM

The Whittier Narrows Dam and the San Antonio Dam, I am glad to say those are the final appropriations needed for those projects. We will not have to ask you for funds for them next year. The San Antonio Channel appropriation is in the budget, and I do not think we need to discuss that except to say we support it fully.

I would like to summarize by going back to the request that your committee consider authorizing the Corps of Engineers to work the coming year on the whole program we have listed and not be confined to the narrow program of the budget.

Mr. EVINS. Has that not been the prevailing practice in the past, giving flexibility to the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. HEDGER. Yes, and we would like to see it continued and broadened.

Mr. EVINS. It is your recommendation that the committee consider an appropriation of an additional $10 million?

Mr. HEDGER. That is the need, but I do not think the Corps of Engineers could get out the plans and specifications to spend much more than the amount in the budget. We think perhaps $15 million could be spent but not the $24 million.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you.

SAN ANTONIO DAM AND CHANNEL PROJECTS

Mr. HEDGER. I have been requested to file a statement on behalf of the San Bernardino County Flood Control District in regard to the San Antonio Dam and Channel projects.

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to receive the statement.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT,
San Bernardino, Calif., April 28, 1955.

The Board of Supervisors of the San Bernardino County Flood Control District hereby express the appreciation of the people of the county for the fine interest and accomplishments made by the various committees as regards the San Antonio dam and channel projects.

These projects were authorized by the 75th Congress, 3d session, Document No. 688 (Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 and as amended August 28, 1937), and subsequently appropriations to begin construction of the dam were made.

As the project is now under construction, we wish to emphasize the urgent need for further appropriations in order that San Antonio Dam construction program may be completed. It is the sincere hope of this board that authorization consisting of $530,000 to complete the dam and $700,000 for San Antonio channel construction be approved.

Your approval of this program would insure the future for a portion of the San Bernardino Valley which was designated as a disaster area.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT,
San Bernardino, Calif.

SAN ANTONIO DAM AND CHANNEL PROJECT

The Board of Supervisors of the San Bernardino County Flood Control District, which is a countywide district organized under the provisions of chapter 929, Statutes of 1945, a special act of the Legislature of the State of California, urges that additional money be made available for the continued construction of the San Antonio Dam and flood-control project, which project has been authorized and which is the subject of reports heretofore presented to Congress by the Corps of Engineers.

Those reports are favorable to the project and set out in considerable detail its necessity, its economic justification, and the urgency of the work which is proposed. They are available and familiar to you, so detailed repetition by us is thought not to be necessary.

We do, however, wish to emphasize certain matters, and to call your attention to ones possibly not directly dealt upon in other reports.

The mountain drainage area tributary to the proposed dam is about 27 square miles. That area, because of topographic features and relation to desert and ocean influences is subject to intense rainfalls and cloudbursts. The average yearly rainfall varies from about 22 inches at the dam to 40 or 50 in higher regions. During storms of great intensity rainfalls of as much as 16 to 18 inches per 24 hours have been recorded.

USGS Water Supply Paper 847 at page 261 shows San Antonio Creek as producing the highest runoff rate per square mile of all United States streams listed in said table.

The elevations within the watershed vary from approximately 2,100 feet at the dam to as much as 10,000 feet, and San Antonio Canyon itself has a fall of between 700 and 800 feet per mile. This canyon empties upon a large unstable fan-shaped debris cone of rather recent origin, and the stream as it leaves the canyon mouth can, under present conditions, range through an angle of more than 90°.

The stream at floodtime with a comparatively small changing of conditions can leave its poorly defined channel bed and continue in any direction over this 90° width. The slope of the cone is from 3 to 6 percent.

Almost unlimited amounts of detritus are in the great moraine, like moving rock and gravel slides in the upper canyon reaches.

It is this combination of steep slopes, intense rainfall and runoff, and unlimited masses of loose material being transported onto this unstable debris cone that made the situation so menacing and dangerous.

There are six cities and several smaller communities, together with a closely built-up urban development of homes and citrus orchards immediately within the easily possible course of this rock and gravel-laden stream. Three transcontinental railroads, an interurban electric line, three interstate, cross-country State highways and innumerable county highways and city streets cross and traverse this threatened area.

As is true in all of southern California, settlement and development have been rapid in this vicinity during the past several years. This location is about midway between the cities of Los Angeles and San Bernardino and about 25 miles from each. Within a very few years this entire distance will be closely built up and densely inhabited. The cities immediately involved are Upland, Ontario, Chino, Claremont, Pomona, and LaVerne.

The increase in assessed valuation of a part of the area in San Bernardino County is as follows:

Assessed valuation

	1938-39	1949-50	1950-51
Ontario City	$8,776,220	$16,785,010	$17,950,010
Upland City	5,248,280	8,221,990	8,296,430
Chino City	1,612,470	4,598,920	4,641,110
Ontario outside (west of Euclid Ave.)	1,555,100	2,369,010	3,785,340
Upland outside (west of Euclid Ave.)	469,287	806,439	----------
Chino outside (west of Euclid Ave.)	1,249,550	2,373,000	----------

The water from the San Antonio watershed is that which is largely necessary for the support of these cities and for the support of extremely valuable citrus districts, and also for the replenishment of several underground basins from which much of the water supply of this area is obtained. The overdraft in that portion of the Chino underground basin dependent upon San Antonio Creek is now from four to five thousand acre-feet per year.

Several hundred thousand dollars of local money have been spent in the construction of conservation works and spreading grounds, but the saving of water in time of large floods is feasible only by the detention storage and debris removal, both of which the proposed dam will provide in satisfactory form.

Damaging floods have occurred in this stream in the years 1906, 1909, 1914, 1916, 1922, 1927, 1938, and 1943. Certain statistical data taken from one of the preliminary examinations, reports having to do with damage from these floods is attached hereto.

We honestly and sincerely believe that a very serious flood hazard exists below the canyon portion of San Antonio Creek, and that the situation is so critical that every possible effort that can be made to the end that the stream be controlled and confined by regulation and channel improvement will be justified.

Population statistics

	1940	1950
San Bernardino County	161,108	[1] 289,800
Ontario	16,044	25,594
Upland	7,118	10,174
Chino	7,483	8,654
West End area: Pomona, Claremont, Chino, Ontario, Upland	95,655	150,000

[1] Increase, 80 percent.

San Bernardino County has experienced one of the largest increases of population in the State and Nation.

Population increases from 1940 to 1950 [1]:	Percent
State of California	43
Los Angeles County	34
Orange County	32
Riverside County	31
San Bernardino County	80

[1] Estimate by California Taxpayers' Association.

NOTE.—Estimates based on calculations by the California Taxpayers' Association, the San Bernardino County Election Department, and the San Bernardino County Chamber of Commerce.

SAN ANTONIO CREEK DAMAGES FROM FLOODS

[From statistical data in Preliminary Examination Report on Santa Ana River and Tributaries dated February 15, 1939]

Description of flood, flood year 1913–14, page 41

In Ontario, Euclid Avenue was a raging torrent and side streets were full from curb to curb. West F Street was badly washed at Laurel Avenue; San Antonio Avenue also suffered, as did Vine Avenue. Most of the streets sustained minor damages. At A Street, storm waters were turned into a new catch basin and into the old storm drain, relieving the flood at A Street and Euclid Avenue (January 26, 1914). On Fourth Street, the new bridge stood, but there was room for six bridges east of it. The Eighth Street Bridge went out (January 27, 1914). On East Ninth Street, Ontario, water 6 feet deep and 60 feet wide came from north of the Pacific Electric Railway tracks onto a tract of land owned by A. P. Moreman. The water went out through Ninth Street and over lots belonging to Arron Brest, then south to the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, flooding homes south of Ninth Street (above was local runoff, not San Antonio Creek).

On Euclid Avenue at 22d and 23d Avenues, great damages was done to groves. The wall was washed away north of the Paul Groves and water came down into the orchards. The Ninth Street road was washed out as it had been in January (Feb. 19, 1914). On the east side of Euclid Avenue, water tore a gulch in a barley field above 24th Street out through the Paine Grove to the Stewart Grove and flooded that entire section (Feb. 27, 1914) local runoff.

Upland experienced its greatest rain. Every avenue running north and south was filled from curb to curb. In every section, water tore through stone walls and ditches and washed orange groves. The Upland downtown district suffered little damage, but in the northern part of the city, groves from 24th Street south on the west side of Euclid Avenue were badly washed (local runoff).

The city of Ontario was isolated; all connecting roads were washed out in many places. The Southern Pacific Railroad lost sections of track at Etiwanda. East of Etiwanda floodwaters cut off Ontario from Colton, Riverside and San Bernardino near the plant of the Southern California Canning Co., on East State Street. Between Upland and San Bernardino the tracks were soft and all trains were annulled.

The new line of the Pacific Electric Railway to San Bernardino was washed out in several places. Floodwater went through recently completed fills, leaving rails and ties dangling high. The auto road also suffered. Foothill and Valley Boulevards were a mass of ravines and gullies in spots where the water concentrated in flood strength (local runoff).

About 150 feet of flume washed out in the San Antonio Canyon, and the local (Ontario) water supply became muddy. San Antonio Creek was a raging torrent that swept everything before it. Its floodwaters reached to the Chino foothills. It was estimated that the stream flowed 140,000 miner's inches most of that night of January 26. In the hills back of Stoddard's Canyon the rainfall was great adding to the flood in San Antonio Canyon. San Antonio Creek tore out the 10th Street bridge and the Southern Pacific Railroad bridge south of A Street, 9 miles from the mouth of the canyon (Jan. 27, 1914).

In the Ontario-Upland area, rainfall for the season totaled 22.47 inches. In the northern part of Ontario Groves from 24th Street south on the west side of Euclid Avenue were badly washed. A cloudburst in San Antonio Canyon was the principal cause, and as usual in cases of damage to orange groves and valuable property, gutted by the stream (Jan. 29, 1914).

Flood year, 1916, page 48

San Antonio Creek had become a river, washing out its bridges (Jan. 17, 1916). Damage in Pomona district was established at $500,000. More than 200 passengers were held up on eastbound trains at Pomona. Twenty-five tourists were marooned at Camp Baldy where rain came down at the rate of 1 inch per hour, sending destructive floods to the valley lands below. A portion of the new State highway was washed out in the Pomona district. At Claremont dynamite was used to divert floodwaters into the old channel of San Antonio Wash to save Pomona College buildings from destruction. A number of orange groves were damaged by the flood, and ranchhouses stood in 3 feet of water (Jan. 18, 1916). The cloudburst caused waters to sweep out of San Antonio Wash and cut across the country to the Claremont School for Boys, which was surrounded.

Flood year, 1921–22, page 50

San Antonio Canyon was wrecked. Water came from the canyon down San Antonio Avenue, damaging streets and washing groves badly. The 11th Street bridge was washed out and washouts of the Pacific Electric Railway and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway kept these railways out of operation (Feb. 26, 1922).

Flood year, 1926–27, page 52

In San Antonio Canyon a heavy rain had fallen for 48 hours, and the creek rose rapidly at Ice House Canyon. Kelley's Camp was buried in 10 feet of snow, and it was expected that the rain would melt the heavy snows augment the flood in San Antonio Creek (Feb. 15, 1927).

Flood year, 1937–38, page 55

According to the United States Weather Bureau, the storm of February 27 to March 3, 1938, originated in the north Pacific Ocean west of Alaska, February 24, 1938, and traveled southeasterly following the coast of Canada and the United States, reaching its greatest intensity in southwestern United States in southern California, southern Arizona, and southwestern New Mexico.

In southern California the precipitation occurred during the period of February 27 to March 3, 1938, and reached its highest intensity during the 7-hour period from 3 a. m. to 10 a. m. on March 2. During the period 3.8 inches of rain were recorded in Los Angeles, or at an average rate of 0.54 inch for the 7 hours. In the mountain areas a greater rainfall intensity occurred during about the same 7-hour period, and this caused maximum flood crests in the streams of southern California.

The storm caused great damage in southern California, southern Nevada, and parts of Arizona. A large number of homes were completely destroyed or badly damaged. Railroads and highways suffered damage estimated at many millions of dollars due to the destruction of bridges and roadbeds. Other facilities, such as telegraph, telephone, gas, and water were severely damaged. For a time all lines of communication were cut off from some localities, except those served by airplanes and by radio. In the Los Angeles engineer district the loss of life from the storm is estimated at 87, and in addition 9 persons were reported missing 3 months after the flood.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

Mr. HILL. The next witness is Mr. John Bryant, representing the Riverside County Flood Control District.

Mr. EVINS. Very well, Mr. Bryant, you may proceed.

Mr. BRYANT. My name is John Bryant. I am chief engineer of the Riverside County Flood Control District, Riverside, Calif. I am appearing here today in behalf of that district.

I have prepared a written statement which I would like to file with the committee at this time.

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to receive it.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Pursuant to the act of Congress, Public No. 406, 75th Congress, approved August 28, 1937, the United States Corps of Engineers completed a Flood Control Survey Report of the Santa Ana River and Tributaries, Calif., dated November 1, 1946. Four projects recommended in this report were authorized by the 1st session of the 81st Congress in H. R. 5472 which was signed by the President, May 17, 1950. Two of the approved projects, the Santa Ana River levees at Riverside and the San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek levees, are in Riverside County, and two in San Bernardino County.

Over 17 years have now elapsed since Congress, recognizing the need for flood protection in this area, first authorized an investigation on the Santa Ana River and its tributaries. During this time serious flood damage and loss of life has occurred. The three transcontinental railways and all the principal highways

in the area have been incapacitated. All shipments by rail or truck into southern California have been blocked for as long as 2 weeks in some instances. In the 1938 flood there was a loss of life of 15 people in the Riverside area and property damage here was estimated at $604,000.

We recognize that it would be impossible for the Federal Government to provide local protection from all our flood problems, so have initiated a program of flood control financed by local taxes. Since 1946 we have spent a total of $1,268,000 for flood control in this area. However, large protection works on the major watersheds within the area are beyond our financial means. It is on these problems that we are asking assistance.

The Santa Ana River at Riverside drains an area of approximately 800 square miles; its channel varies from 300 to 700 feet in width and its banks on the left side of the river vary from 3 to 4 feet in height. The estimated capacity of the river channel at Riverside is 20,000 cubic feet per second, and the estimated peak discharge at this point during the 1938 flood was 100,000 cubic feet per second. Overflow of the river at this point may occur from any medium or large flood which in turn would inundate approximately 1,500 acres of land in the north section of the city of Riverside.

Numerous attempts have been made in the past to prevent this overflow by the construction of rail and wire-fence revetments which in each case were subsequently destroyed. More recently, since the 1938 flood, the area was partially protected by an earth levee revetted with granite riprap. This levee was built by the county of Riverside with State financial assistance at a total cost of $120,000. The levee is approximately 15 feet above stream-ber surface, has a 20-foot crown width, and 1½-to-1 side slopes. The river side of the levee is protected by granite rock riprap placed in an amount of 6 tons per lineal foot and extending 10 feet below the level of the stream bed for protection against scour. The total length of levee constructed is 6,000 feet. This levee provides partial protection against most floods for about 500 acres on the left side of the river, and the plan of improvement proposed by the district engineer would extend this levee downstream of the Rubidoux Bridge, a distance of 14,000 feet.

Along the right side of the river, the low banks would be overtopped by a medium or large flood which would overflow most of the community of Rubidoux, formerly known as West Riverside. Nearly 1,800 acres of land on the right side of the river are subject to inundation. On this side of the river, many attempts have been made by local interest in the past to construct flood-control works which have also been destroyed during major floods. After the 1938 flood, the county of Riverside, with financial assistance from the State of California, constructed a levee which affords partial protection to the community of Rubidoux and which directs the flow of smaller floods into the channel under the Rubidoux Bridge. However, a medium or large flood would probably breach the levees and overflow most of Rubidoux and might destroy the bridge. The plan of the district engineer is to utilize a portion of the existing levee by adding to the rock riprap now in place and in addition extending the Rubidoux Bridge 750 feet westward and constructing a levee to high ground 5,550 feet upstream from the bridge and continuing the levee downstream, a distance of 5,000 feet from the bridge.

The Riverside levee project will protect a total area of approximately 3,900 acres. The damage during the 1938 flood in this area, with an estimated valuation of approximately $3 million was $604,000. There was an estimated loss of life of 15 people by drowing. The present valuation of this area is estimated at approximately $16 million, an increase of more than 400 percent. Damages occurring now from a flood similar to that of 1938 would be over $3 million. The population of this area has more than doubled since 1940 so we could expect no less than 30 people to lose their lives in a similar flood occurring today. However, due to the crowded conditions of this area, the loss of life would probably be much greater.

The tributaries Bautista Creek and the San Jacinto River, near the towns of Hemet and San Jacinto, have an average gradient of 80 to 30 feet per mile respectively. The channels are unstable and poorly defined. Local interests have since 1908 attempted to provide flood protection. Levees have been constructed and protected against erosion by wire, rail, and brush revetements for over a distance of 11 miles. Those levees are relatively low and would be breached by a medium or large flood. The recommended plan proposed 1 levee 15,580 feet downstream along the left bank of Bautista Creek from the canyon mouth to State Highway 74, and a second levee would extend downstream 2,100 feet along the right bank of Bautista Creek from a hill near Valle Vista to State

Highway 74. The levee along the left side of the San Jacinto River would extend downstream 20,750 feet from a point near the mouth of Bautista Creek. The improvements would protect Valle Vista, Hemet, San Jacinto, and valuable agricultural lands covering an area of 13,000 acres and property valued at $11 million.

Riverside County has experienced the same accelerated growth in population and increased property values which are typical to other communities in southern California. Between the time of the flood in 1938 to the date of the district engineer's report, there was an increase of over 50 percent in population, and as of 1948, the population had increased 100 percent over and above that which existed during the 1938 flood. All indications show signs of continued growth, and this growth and the welfare of the entire area is dependent on adequate control of the floodwaters of the Santa Ana River. It is imperative that this flood-control work be accomplished at the earliest possible date.

The President recognizes the flood problems on the Santa Ana River and has requested Congress to appropriate $50,000 toward the advanced planning of the Riverside levees. For this we are indeed grateful. However, we strongly urge the committee and Congress to increase this amount to $100,000 and appropriate an additional $100,000 for advanced planning on the Bautista Creek and the San Jacinto River levees.

When Congress requested the investigation of flood control along the Santa Ana River in 1937, the Board of Supervisors of Riverside County by resolution gave all assurances that the county would sponsor a flood-control project and do whatever necessary and required of local interests. This board of supervisors wishes now to reaffirm and reassure the Federal Government that the proposed plans meet with their approval and that the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District still stands ready to assume its obligations.

Mr. BRYANT. I would like to take a few minutes to briefly expand on this written statement.

In 1937 Congress authorized the Corps of Engineers to prepare a flood-control survey report of the Santa Ana River and its tributaries. That report was completed in 1946, submitted to the Congress, and later approved. Four projects recommended in this report were authorized by this Congress. Two of the approved projects, the Santa Ana River levees at Riverside and the San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek levees, are in Riverside County.

Inasmuch as the proposed flood-control measures on these two projects are very similar, I will confine my remarks to the Santa Ana River levees at Riverside.

I have brought a picture which I would like to present with your permission.

This is a picture of the Santa Ana River at Riverside looking upstream to the north. The area colored in blue along the lower part of the map is some 3,000 acres of land that were inundated in the 1938 flood. The discharge at this point was 100,000 second-feet in that flood. The uncontrolled flow of the Missouri River and the uncontrolled flow of the Yellowstone River are approximately 30,000 second-feet. This flood was over 3 times the discharge of those 2 rivers during high water.

Hydrologists have told us that the flood of 1938 had a frequency of occurrence of approximately once every 50 years, so we are not showing you the maximum flood that we know will occur at some future time. According to the report of the United States Corps of Engineers this stretch of river has a capacity of only 20,000 second-feet. In other words, whenever we have a discharge greater than that it overflows the banks, inundates the surrounding land, and considerable damage results.

The population of the area inundated in 1938 is now twice as great as it was in 1938. Property values are five times as great as they were in 1938. According to a report issued by the Corps of Engineers, if we were to have a similar flood now we could anticipate $3 million of damage. According to the report the 1938 flood caused $60,000 of damage.

After the 1938 flood, Riverside County, with the assistance of the State, constructed a levee up here [indicating] and constructed another levee which progresses upstream from this bridge for a distance of about 1,800 feet. We recognize, as do the Corps of Engineers, that these two levees are very inadequate. We know that the amount of $3 million in damages is perhaps not great and that you probably have had many projects presented to you that show more damages. However, there is another factor to be considered which I think it is very difficult for any of us to place a price tag on. One thousand five hundred people lost their lives in the 1938 flood. Under a similar flood we would expect over 30,000 people to lose their lives. This is a serious problem. The President has recognized the seriousness of it and has recommended to Congress $50,000 for advance planning. We are thankful for this. However, we feel the time element involved here is very serious. Every 10 to 12 years we have a major flood on the Santa Ana River and we are long past due.

I sincerely trust you will see your way clear to appropriate $100,000 for advance planning on the Riverside levees, and an additional $100,000 for advanced planning on the Bautista Creek and the San Jacinto River levees.

I hope I never have to witness another flood like the 1938 flood on the Santa Ana. I do not want to be there and count the dead bodies and to answer the questions as to why after the 17 years we have had to prepare for another flood adequate controls have not been provided.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Bryant.

Mr. HILL. Congressman John Phillips may wish to add something to Mr. Bryant's statement.

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Phillips is a senior member of the committee and I can assure you that he will take care of your interests.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Did Mr. Bryant point out that a major highway was completely shut off in the floods? Also, between the two smoke areas or shafts [indicating] is the San Bernardino line. During the war years the San Bernardino, because of the railroads, the highways, and the various defense industries, coming together, that part of the river received attention, with our complete concurrence, of course, and we stepped aside. I have been assured by the water resources board that this matter would be on their priority list long before this, and I am beginning to be curious as to how long we are expected to step aside.

I have no other testimony to give. I think Mr. Bryant made a very complete statement.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Phillips.

CARBON CANYON DAM

Mr. HILL. Congressman Utt.

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to hear from our distinguished colleague.

Mr. UTT. I ask permission to submit a written statement at a future date for insertion in the record.

Mr. EVINS. We shall be very glad to accord you that privilege.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

I wish to submit the following statement in support of the appropriation contained in the Corps of Engineers budget in the amount of $50,000 for completion of the report on Carbon Canyon Dam in Orange County, Calif.

The County of Orange has recently completed a comprehensive study which indicates that the Carbon Canyon Dam would permit floodwater control which would be of first importance in protecting lives and property downstream from the proposed site. The plan evolved by the county calls for the expenditure of $40 million.

Property subject to potential flood damage includes a fast growing number of homes and an increasingly large number of industries.

Carbon Canyon Creek which flows below the proposed dam runs through the heart of the city of Anaheim which has a population of 30,059 and an assessed valuation of nearly $40 million. In addition, two large Navy installations, Los Alamitos Naval Air Station, and Seal Beach Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, are affected by the floodwaters from this creek.

During the rainy season in southern California the creeks and rivers which are dry during many months of the year often become raging torrents and spread out over a wide area. In 138 many lives were lost along Carbon Canyon Creek and millions of dollars of damage occurred to railroads, highways, and industries. While we have not had a repetition of the severity of the 1938 storm, considerable storm damage did occur in this same area in 1941, 1943, and 1944 and in January of 1952.

In the 1938 flood the Los Angeles County flood-control works were only partially completed, but even in that stage they saved many lives and prevented a great deal of damage. Los Angeles County at that time had a population of over 2½ million people and an assessed valuation of nearly $2 billion. In that storm 32 lives were lost and an estimated $40 million damage was done.

Comparing this to Orange County, which had a population of 127,000 people and an assessed valuation of under $200 million, 45 lives were lost and an estimated $14 million of damage was sustained (floods of March 1938 in southern California, USGS Water Supply Paper No. 54).

In other words, with storm duration and intensities being approximately the same, Orange County with a population of only 5 percent of that of Los Angeles County had losses of life almost 1½ times and about one-third as much property damage as the adjacent county. At the same time while 4,000 persons were driven from their homes in Los Angeles County the same number were dislocated in the smaller Orange County. Only 1,755 homes were damaged in Los Angeles County while the smaller Orange County had 2,100 damaged.

Economic justification for this dam has increased considerably since Congress originally authorized the expenditure of funds by the Corps of Engineers for this project report. Assessed valuation of Orange County in 1940 was under $200 million and now exceeds $600 million. It is steadily climbing because of industrial and residential development in the county.

In the next few years Orange County population will have quadrupled 1938 at the present rate of increase. Disneyland is nearing completion in the Anaheim area and is being set up to handle automobiles at the rate of 3,000 per hour with an original estimate of attendance the first year being set at between 4 and 5 million people. This estimate has now been revised upward to near 9 million people.

The Corps of Engineers has expended some $150,000 which has so far been authorized by the Congress and their report is approximately 75 percent complete and appropriation of $50,000 will complete the report.

Naturally everyone familiar with flood-damage potential as demonstrated in 1938 and other years realizes the seriousness of the threat. County and city officials are taking steps to reduce this threat as soon as possible, and it is unanimously agreed that the Carbon Canyon Dam is one of the most important steps and should be constructed as soon as possible.

I hope that you and your committee will give favorable consideration to the granting of this appropriation so that the work of the Corps of Engineers may be completed.

Very sincerely yours,

J. B. UTT.

Mr. UTT. I would like to present at this time Mr. Willis H. Warner, chairman of the Orange County Board of Supervisors; and Mr. J. A. Woolley, consulting engineer.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, gentlemen.

Mr. WARNER. I would like to make a brief oral statement in regard to Carbon Canyon Dam. That is in the Corps of Engineers budget in the amount of $50,000 this year. Earlier, in discussing it with the water resources board, we estimated the amount necessary to complete the planning of this project at $125,000. The Corps of Engineers have indicated that $50,000 was adequate and have included that in their budgets, and we wish to support that budget item of the Corps of Engineers covering the Carbon Canyon Dam.

This project is extremely important in Orange County. The stream traverses highly developed country, not only residential but industrial. Also, important military installations are subject to inundation from this stream.

The stream also traverses the city of Anaheim, with a population of 30,000 and an assessed value of $40 million.

The county is in the process at the present time of developing local drainage facilities, and the completion of the planning of the Carbon Canyon Dam is very essential to us in the carrying out of that work.

We would very much appreciate your favorable consideration of the request of the Corps of Engineers for the Carbon Canyon Dam.

Mr. EVINS. How far advanced is the Carbon Canyon Dam project?

Mr. WARNER. The plans are 75 percent completed at this time. They were interrupted twice, by World War II and by the Korean war. There has been approximately $150,000 spent on it and it requires, according to the estimate of the Corps of Engineers, $50,000 to complete it.

Mr. EVINS. You are asking just for the budget request?

Mr. WARNER. We are asking just for the budget request.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Warner. Mr. Woolley, do you have a statement?

Mr. WOOLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, about all I think it is necessary for me to do is to reiterate Mr. Warner's statement as to the necessity of moving this project to completion. We have interviewed the Corps of Engineers to determine just what the status was of the plans and the report. They have told us they are somewhere between 75 and 80 percent completed. The amount of money to complete the work is estimated at roughly $50,000.

The county has proceeded on the basis of this report and employed our firm to make a complete comprehensive study of flood control in the county for the protection of the lives and property in that county. This report was completed and filed with the Board of Supervisors of Orange County last week.

The Carbon Canyon Dam itself is a most important function of this comprehensive plan. No one is actually to blame for the delays in getting this done. We have had a couple wars. But Orange County would like to have the plans completed so that the next step can be started.

Downstream from the proposed dam is the city of Anaheim, which has 10 or 12 industries of major importance. The Orange County problem is to protect its area, but first we must know that this dam will

be built. We must make that determination and the progress report of the Corps of Engineers is expected to answer that problem.

I think that is about all.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Woolley.

SANTA CLARA RIVER LEVEE AND SANTA PAULA CREEK CHANNEL, STEWART CANYON DEBRIS BASIN AND CHANNEL

Mr. HILL. Congressman Teague is here in behalf of Stewart Canyon Dam, Santa Clara River, and Santa Paula Creek projects.

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Teague has been most diligent and persuasive. This is his third appearance before this committee.

Mr. TEAGUE. Not on these projects but on others.

I am appearing in behalf of the Santa Clara River levee and Santa Paula Creek Channel, and the Stewart Canyon debris basin and channel.

Somebody told the Ventura County Flood-Control District that this committee would like to have 25 copies of their statement. I would like to submit on behalf of the Ventura County Flood-Control District this statement.

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to receive it.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF EDWIN L. CARTY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, VENTURA COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate this opportunity to present to you through the Honorable Charles M. Teague, Member of Congress, 13th Congressional District of the State of California, a statement with regard to two flood-control projects under the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in the Ventura County Flood-Control District. The projects are (1) Santa Clara River levee and Santa Paula Creek channel, and (2) Stewart Canyon debric basin and channel. These projects were recommended in report of survey on Santa Clara River, Calif., for flood control, submitted December 20, 1945, by the district engineer, and report of survey on flood control, Ventura River, Calif., dated October 15, 1940, submitted by the district engineer, respectively.

Ventura County is a coastal county, lying adjacent to and northerly of Los Angeles County. The terrain is both mountainous and alluvial, combining flood-control problems peculiar to both types of terrain. The valley plain areas are highly developed; including urban and industrial development; agricultural development, with citrus and walnut ranches, as well as field crops; and a large oil-producing development.

(1) Santa Clara River project, as recommended, consists of two parts: (*a*) A levee on the left bank of the lower section of the river, and (*b*) a channel for the lower end of Santa Paula Creek, a tributary.

The Santa Clara River runs westerly and southwesterly through the county to the Pacific Ocean. On the south side lies the Oxnard Plain, which, as indicated by the map attached hereto, is completely within the overflow area of the river should it leave its banks in the lower reaches. This plain is highly developed insofar as the urban and suburban communities are concerned, together with the attendant commercial and industrial plants, as well as agricultural enterprises. It also contains three military installations; namely, the United States Naval Advanced Base Depot at Port Hueneme, the United States Naval Air Missile Test Center at Point Mugu, and the Oxnard Air Force Base, near Oxnard. Both of the naval installations are permanent installations, and negotiations are in progress with a view to making the Air Force base a permanent installation.

U. S. Highways 101 and 101 alternate traverse this plain and join south of the Santa Clara River, continuing as one highway across the river and north to San Francisco. State Route 118 must also cross the Santa Clara River within the overflow area. The main line of the Southern Pacific Railroad also traverses the Oxnard Plain and crosses the Santa Clara River in the same vicinity as U. S.

Highway 101. A few miles above the Pacific Ocean, the river, which is a typical California stream subject to high intensity of rainfall and runoff, emerges from an area fairly well confined by mountains and hills into the Oxnard Plain area where the river has poorly defined banks of sand and gravel. The river is progressively eroding to the southwest in the direction of the prevailing downgrade, although local works of a temporary nature attempt to maintain a channel generally westerly of the poorly defined existing banks. The latest floods have caused considerable damage to highway and property; and it is not improbable that a major flood might break through the banks in the neighborhood of State Route 118 where it crosses the Saticoy Bridge, and form a new channel across the highly developed Oxnard Plain.

Such a breakthrough would sever U. S. Highway 101, 101 alternate, and State Route 118, as well as the main coastline of the Southern Pacific Railroad. These highways serve all traffic between Los Angeles and the north coastal area, and the Southern Pacific line is the only direct rail connection between Los Angeles and the area. The loss or damage to the highways and railroad, or to bridges and approaches would be disastrous. The operation of the military installations would be seriously handicapped, and a very serious disruption of traffic would be caused, from an area as well as local viewpoint. In addition, with plans being made for evacuation of Los Angeles and other cities in connection with civil-defense plans, such disruption of transportation arteries is unthinkable.

The construction of 5 miles of levee on the left bank of the river, as indicated on the drawing attached hereto, would prevent further possibility of the Santa Clara River eroding a new or enlarged channel south of the present one, with consequent damage to urban, industrial, and agricultural lands, and military establishments as outlined above, and would also assure an uninterrupted flow of highway and rail traffic from the Los Angeles area to the north for all the everyday requirements, as well as for the successful operation of the military installations and civil-defense plans. This proposed levee is the most important part of the entire Santa Clara River project.

Santa Paula Creek is a high-velocity stream, the lower portion of which travels on a debris cone higher than the city of Santa Paula, which lies adjacent to and westerly of the creek. This creek is crossed in the lower section by a branch of the Southern Pacific Railroad, which connects the San Joaquin Valley route with the coast route. It is also crossed by State Highway 126, which connects United States Highway 101 at Ventura with United States Highway 99, which latter highway runs from Los Angeles to San Francisco via the San Joaquin Valley.

The improvement of this channel would thus protect the city of Santa Paula and the adjoining agricultural lands from flooding, as well as insure continuous highway and rail traffic on the State highway and the Southern Pacific Railroad.

The extent to which this problem has grown acute can well be indicated by comparison of some of the figures presented in the Corps of Engineers report in December, 1945, as compared with similar figures at the present time. In the report it was contemplated that the average population in the Oxnard Plain for the 50-year period, 1946–95, would be approximately 30 percent greater than in 1945, whereas the actual population increase to the present time is 70 percent; and it is contemplated that the increase will continue at a rate not less than 6 to 7 percent per year. This growth in population has caused an increase in the average values of residential, business, and industrial improvements in about the same percentage as the population increase. It is estimated that the present population of the area subject to overflow is 41,500.

A few comparisons of the estimated average values of property in the overflow area during the 50-year period, 1946–95, without flood control, as set forth in the Corps of Engineers report, with current estimates of the same value are tabulated below.

Property	Corps of Engineers' estimate average values, period 1946–95	1955 estimated values
Residential, business and industrial	$13,449,000	$17,590,000
Agricultural lands, including crops, irrigation system, machinery and equipment, and livestock	23,129,000	104,385,000
Transportation	4,083,000	5,025,000
Military establishments	40,000,000	208,000,000

(2) Stewart Canyon debris basin and channel is the second project for flood-control work in the Ventura River Basin. The first project, a levee on the lower Ventura River, has been constructed with Federal funds and is being maintained by the Ventura County Flood Control District.

Stewart Canyon is a steep canyon with a watershed which has a top elevation of about 6,000 feet and drops down to an elevation of 650 feet in a relatively short distance. It then enters into a fairly flat area, and the channel now runs directly into the city of Ojai. It is subject to extremely heavy rainfall of short duration with consequent high intensity of runoff and large debris flows. The situation was aggravated by a severe fire in 1948, which almost completely denuded the watershed of protective growth. Following this fire, the Corps of Engineers expended emergency funds to construct a temporary sump for the protection of life and property. The flood-control district acquired the property on which the work was done, as well as sufficient property for the permanent debris dam installation. The project is for the protection of life and property, as well as of highways, streets, and railroad connection to the city of Ojai.

Since southern California has been in a severe drought cycle for the past 11 years, it appears that a wet cycle should be commencing within the next 2 or 3 years. This approaching wet cycle makes it imperative that flood-control measures be undertaken and completed in the near future to avoid possibility of severe damage from major floods during the wet cycle, and therefore this report is submitted for your consideration. It is requested that, as a minimum, at least the planning funds be appropriated this year so that the preparation of final plans may be undertaken in order to permit further appropriations to be made for the actual construction of the projects in the near future.

I wish to thank you for the opportunity of being able to present these matters to your subcommittee through our representative in Congress.

Respectfully,

EDWIN L. CARTY,
Chairman, Board of Supervisors, Ventura County Flood Control District.

Authorized Federal flood-control projects—Santa Clara River, Santa Paula Creek project

	1945	1955
Corps of Engineers estimate of Federal Costs:		
Santa Clara River levee	$1,690,000	$3,650,000
Santa Paula Creek	1,320,000	3,100,000
Total	3,010,000	6,750,000
Stewart Canyon project	[1] 520,000	1,460,000

[1] 1940.

Mr. TEAGUE. I will not read it all but I would like to emphasize certain points brought out in the statement. I will start out by saying that it is requested that, as a minimum, at least the planning funds be appropriated this year so that the preparation of final plans may be undertaken in order to permit further appropriations to be made for the actual construction of the projects in the near future.

The sums requested are $120,000 in the case of the Santa Clara River project and $26,000 for the Stewart Canyon project. It is my understanding these items are not in the President's budget.

I wish I had a map similar to the one shown you for Riverside County, because we have a similar situation. It is quite an analogous problem. There is one principal difference. There are three major military installations south of the Santa Clara River subject to being inundated. These military installations, namely, the United States Naval Advanced Base Depot at Port Hueneme, the United States Naval Air Missile Test Center at Point Mugu, and the Oxnard Air Force Base near Oxnard, have an estimated value of $208 million.

Also, United States Highway 101 crosses the river; and the main coastline of the Southern Pacific Railroad crosses that river also.

We have values of roughly $104 million in agricultural lands, $17 million in residential, business, and industrial property, in addition to the $208 million value in military establishments and $5 million in transportation facilities. So there is a lot of monetary consideration in this thing subject to one of the serious floods that occur in California.

The other project is the Stewart Canyon project. It is proposed to construct a debris basin and channel north of the city of Ojai.

The situation is that Stewart Canyon is a steep canyon with a watershed which has a top elevation of about 6,000 feet and drops down to an elevation of 650 feet in a few miles. It then enters into a fairly flat area and the channel which now runs directly into the city of Ojai is subject to extremely heavy rainfall of short duration with consequent high intensity of runoff and large debris flows, resulting in severe property damages and loss of life. The only way the small city of Ojai, with a population of about 3,000, can be protected is by a debris dam or catch basin.

The statement I have left with you sets forth the problem in greater detail. I hope the committee will give consideration to getting them started.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you for your fine statement, Congressman Teague.

Mr. HAND. Let me comment to my friends from California that every witness so far has presented his statement clearly and with celerity, and I want to congratulate them and the gentlemen from California.

Mr. TEAGUE. Thank you.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if we could proceed out of order and hear from Congressman Moss at this time.

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Moss has also been before the committee before, diligently representing his district.

FOLSOM DAM

Mr. MOSS. The first gentleman I desire to introduce has also been before the committee before, and I am introducing him at this time out of turn because he has another engagement. I would like to present to you Mr. Charles W. Deterding, manager of the County of Sacramento, Calif.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Deterding.

Mr. DETERDING. My name is Charles W. Deterding. I am manager of the county of Sacramento.

The Folsom Dam project is practically completed, 90 percent or more. We are asking for a final appropriation of $4,150,000 to complete the project.

Without going into a lot of detail, I want to express our appreciation to this committee for the very courteous way in which you have always received us here. I hope someday you can come out to California and see the Folsom project so that we may have an opportunity to extend to you our hospitality and an expression of our appreciation.

I have the resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Sacramento authorizing me to appear before the commit-

tee, and I also have a statement I would like to file relative to the project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Deterding. We will be glad to receive them.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CALIF., ON FOLSOM DAM

RESOLUTION NO. 14,437

Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated funds for the construction of the Folsom Dam; and

Whereas the dam is now approximately 90 percent completed; and

Whereas the floodwaters of the American River are still a menace to the city and county of Sacramento: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Sacramento, State of California, earnestly urges that sufficient funds be appropriated to complete the work of the construction in the next fiscal year; and be it further

Resolved, That Charles W. Deterding, county executive of the county of Sacramento, be authorized to personally appear at hearings before the proper committees in Washington, D. C., to urge the allocation of funds to complete the Folsom Dam project.

Passed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Sacramento, State of California, this 29th day of April 1955, by the following vote, to wit:

Ayes: Supervisors Bonetti, Elmer, Hoffman, Kelley, Garlick.

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

[SEAL]

JAS. R. GARLICK,
Chairman of the Board of Supervisors
of the County of Sacramento, State of California.

Attest:

C. C. LARUE,
County Clerk.
By WM. H. DICK,
Deputy Clerk.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES W. DETERDING, MANAGER, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

The Folsom Dam is practically completed. Water is now being stored behind the dam and by next winter the flood-control features of the project will be in full operation.

The flood-protection levees along the right bank of the American River are now the only feature remaining to put the project in complete overall operation.

The flood-control features of the Folsom Dam are designed to release 115,000 cubic feet per second. The bankfull capacity of the American River is approximately 70,000 cubic feet per second. Provision must, therefore, be provided by constructing a levee on the right bank of the American River to protect highly developed agricultural lands and urban areas from flood hazards.

This project was authorized by an act of Congress, second session, 1954, H. R. 9859.

The authorization provides for the extension of the levee along the north bank of the American River approximately 7 miles upstream. The area reclaimed comprises 3,300 acres.

In 1950 floods caused damage in this area in excess of $3 million.

We are requesting that $300,000 be appropriated to start construction.

The county will be required to spend at least $500,000 for rearrangement of highways and bridges.

AMERICAN RIVER LEVEES

Mr. DETERDING. I would like to make a brief statement with regard to the American River levees.

The flood-control features of the Folsom Dam are designed to release 115,000 cubic feet per second. The bankfull capacity of the

American River is approximately 70,000 cubic feet per second. It is therefore necessary that a levee be constructed on the right bank of the American River to protect highly developed agricultural lands and urban areas from flood hazards. We are requesting that $300,000 be appropriated to start construction of that project .

I want to further join with Mr. Luther in support of the old Sacramento River project for the major and minor tributaries, that are on the list for consideration.

Mr. EVINS. Are the funds you are requesting identical with these in the budget?

Mr. DETERDING. They are identical with those in the budget.

That is my understanding.

Mr. HILL. With the exception of the Sacramento River and American River.

Mr. DETERDING. They are in the budget. I do not know the exact amount.

Thank you.

Mr. MOSS. I would now like to present Mr. George Lodi, chairman of the California Flood Control Conference and a member of the State reclamation board.

Mr. LODI. I do not have a prepared statement. I am not on the agenda.

My name is George Lodi. I want to substantiate the testimony that has been presented by the people who have already participated. As Congressman Moss stated, I am chairman of a statewide group of people that meet annually and discuss budgetary matters and discuss the several individual projects for the State as a unit, preparatory to presenting them to the State water resources board, which is the agency that speaks to the State of California; and as a member of the State reclamation board, it is a fellow member of the board who has been authorized to speak for them.

I merely want to say that we appreciate your consideration of our projects and also appreciate the diligence that our Congressmen have shown in attending these meetings. They have demonstrated to us that they are watching out for the problems in their districts.

Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you.

SACRAMENTO RIVER MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES

Mr. HILL. Congressman Clair Engle is here.

Mr. EVINS. It will be a pleasure to hear our distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I am here supporting funds for all the California projects outlined by the other witnesses who have appeared and who will appear, and I am here specifically in behalf of the Sacramento River major and minor tributaries projects.

I regret to say there is no item in the submitted budget for the Sacramento River major and minor tributaries.

These are units originally authorized in the 1944 Flood Control Act and this particular project, Mr. Chairman, has the unique distinction of being built from the back end first. When they started out to build the levees on the Sacramento River major and minor tributaries, they built the levees at the lower end first. It was like building a house and

not putting any roof on it. As a consequence, the Federal Government has spent something over $1 million on the levees on the lower end of this project but the floods of course accumulate up above and go around the levees, and as a result the levees are no good and the project fails to serve the function it was designed to serve because it is not finished.

It reminds me of the time the CAA came to my district and wanted to build an airport on a hilltop and decided to build the short runway first crossways to the wind, thinking the Federal Government would build the long runway. Today at Alturas there sits a fine airport with one short runway crossways to the wind. The long runway has never been built.

We have the same situation on the Sacramento River major and minor tributaries. The project in its present status is not economical; it will not work on the basis of experiments now made by the Federal Government on the project. As I say, it is like building a house and leaving the roof off. It will not serve the purpose the way it has been constructed.

I know how difficult it is to get money in a budget where none is recommended in the budget, but it is a waste of money to build the lower end of a project and leave the upper end unfinished, and leave the Federal Government with a loss instead of a benefit, and I hope you gentlemen will give this particular project some attention so that it will not stand as a monument to governmental inefficiency and blundering. By appropriating $750,000 to complete it, it will serve the purposes for which it was designed and will be a profitable undertaking for the Federal Government rather than a loss.

Thank you for your kindness.

Mr. EVINS. For the information of the committee, when was this levee work initiated?

Mr. ENGLE. The project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944, and I will ask Mr. Luther to tell you when the work was started.

Mr. LUTHER. The first appropriation was in 1950 and there was one in 1951, as I recall.

Mr. EVINS. And none since that date?

Mr. LUTHER. No. They built the lower half and the other half is sitting there.

Mr. ENGLE. It is ridiculous.

Mr. EVINS. How much has been spent so far?

Mr. LUTHER. $1.8 million.

Mr. ENGLE. $1.8 million going down the drain. As I said, it is like building a house without a roof. I want $750,000 to put the roof on.

Mr. EVINS. You have made a very persuasive statement, and I assure you the committee will give it careful consideration.

Mr. HAND. Was there any local objection to the plans of the Corps of Engineers at the time the work was started?

Mr. ENGLE. There was not. The Corps of Engineers did it that way to satisfy the complaints of some people downstream. They were afraid the levees would be built at the upper end and they would be left in the lurch, so the people on the upper end said, "Start at the lower end first."

Mr. HAND. And the people on the upper end lost?

Mr. ENGLE. Everybody lost, because the levees will not work as presently constructed. The water runs around them.

Mr. HAND. Thank you.

SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN RIVERS PROJECTS

Mr. Moss. The next witness is Mr. John M. Luther, manager of the California Central Valleys Flood Control Association.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Luther.

Mr. LUTHER. My name is John M. Luther, from Sacramento. I am representing about 60 reclamation districts and all of these projects with respect to the Sacramento Valley that have been reported to date are in that area that I am representing.

I have a prepared statement I would like to file, if I may, for the record.

Mr. EVINS. It will be received.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY JOHN M. LUTHER, MANAGER OF THE CALIFORNIA CENTRAL VALLEYS FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION

This statement is submitted on behalf of some 65 reclamation districts in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys representing an area in excess of 650,000 acres. We support the statewide program recommended to the committee by the water resources board of California. The projects with which we are directly concerned, however, are those which have been authorized for the protection of the Sacramento and lower San Joaquin Valleys which include:

Sacramento River flood-control project
San Joaquin River project below the mouth of the Merced River
Sacramento River major and minor tributaries (Butte Creek and Cherokee Canal)
American River levees
Black Butte Dam and Reservoir
Folsom Dam and Reservoir

While this statement will deal with only two of these projects, the association supports the appropriations for all of them as presented by other witnesses appearing here today.

SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

The Sacramento River flood-control project was authorized as a Federal flood-control project in the act of 1917. The total estimated Federal cost of the project is $64,400,000 of which $50,600,000 will have been appropriated for expenditure to June 30, 1955. The remaining Federal cost is $13,800,000.

The authorized project contemplates the control of the flood waters from some 27 rivers, creeks, and sloughs by means of leveed river channels, leveed bypasses, and the enlargement of the river channel below Cache Slough. The project extends from Collinsville on the south to Chico Landing in Butte County, and when completed will protect an area in excess of 1 million acres of highly developed agricultural lands and rapidly growing urban areas in the Sacramento Valley and delta.

At the present time levees totalling 970 miles have been constructed or reconstructed by the Federal or State agencies and landowners. About 60 percent of these levees have been constructed by the Federal Government. The remaining 40 percent have been constructed by State agencies and landowners. The remaining work on the project consists largely of eliminating the unstable bank conditions along the river, particularly in those areas where the levees have been built on the river bank or where, through inadequate bank protection, the berms have been lost by caving and erosion. This project represents one of long-standing contract between the Federal and State governments. To date, expeditures amounting to approximately $150 million have been made, approximately one-third of which has been expended by the United States and two-thirds by the State of California and other local interests.

In order to maintain the present rate of improvement we are requesting an appropriation of $5 million to complete various units of the project. This will include work on Yolo bypass, Steamboat Slough, Sutter Slough, Elkhorn and Minor Sloughs, the Colusa Trough, Feather River clearing, and the Sacramento River. Expenditures of this amount would require approximately $1 million of State funds for rights-of-way and relocation of utilities, and the State of California has in its budget funds necessary to meet all local cooperation requirements.

SACRAMENTO RIVER MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES

A number of units are included in this project which was authorized in the 1944 Flood Control Act as modifications to the Sacramento River flood-control project.

One of these units is Butte Creek for which funds were originally appropriated during fiscal years 1950 and 1951. This unit consists of channel enlargement and clearing on Butte Creek along its lower reaches, levee, and channel clearing along the upper portion of the creek and a diversion structure on Little Chico Creek to divert excess flood flows into the enlarged channel of Butte Creek. A major part of the economic justification was the Little Chico Creek diversion, thereby preventing flood damages in the city of Chico, it being found more economical to divert such flows to Butte Creek than to enlarge the channel of Little Chico Creek through the city. The 1950 and 1951 appropriations were expended by the Army on lower Butte Creek and that portion of the project has been completed. Since that date, however, no further funds have been made available. Cost of completion of the upper portion is estimated at $750,000 and until this work is done the value of the project cannot be realized.

The State water resources board and the association are requesting a total of $2 million to be appropriated for the major and minor tributaries, which item includes completion of the Little Chico Creek diversion and Butte Creek levees. The balance of the funds are recommended for initiation of construction on other units of the project, particularly Cherokee Canal, Mud Creek, and Sandy Gulch.

Summary of appropriation requests on projects in the area of this association

Sacramento River flood-control project	$5,000,000
Sacramento River major and minor tributaries	2,000,000
San Joaquin River below the mouth of the Merced River	1,000,000
Black Butte Dam	100,000
American River levees	300,000
Folsom Dam	4,666,000

Mr. LUTHER. I simply want to make a brief statement in connection with one of those projects, which is the Sacramento River project. The Sacramento River is the second oldest Federal flood-control project in the United States. It was authorized in 1917. The river is our largest California river. It has peak flows up to as high as 500,000 cubic feet per second. It is a real river, a live river, the year round. Its annual flow is 15 million to 16 million acre-feet.

The project consists of about 970 miles of levees, including levees along the lower end of two of the major tributaries. During the last few years we have had some substantial appropriations. There is $4 million in the budget for this coming year to complete that levee work and the bank revetment which is required. Our request is for $5 million. However, I think the budget amount represents a satisfactory program for the coming year.

That is all that I have.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Chairman, the next witness is Mr. Douglas B. Cohen, a member of the State reclamation board.

Mr. COHEN. My name is Douglas Cohen. I have a prepared statement that I would like to file for the record at this point.

Mr. EVINS. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Douglas B. Cohen. The Reclamation Board of California, of which I am a member, has designated me to represent it at this hearing, and with your permission I request that this statement be inserted in the printed record.

For the past 42 years the reclamation board has functioned as the State agency designated by the Legislature of the State of California to cooperate with the Federal Government through the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in the planning and construction of flood-control work on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries.

The reclamation board considers that it is of paramount importance to the State of California that adequate funds be provided for all the flood-control projects that have been recommended to you at this hearing by Mr. Claire Hill, vice chairman of the State Water Resources Board of California.

Those items which primarily concern my board, for which funds are requested for the fiscal year 1956, are as follows:

Sacramento engineering district

Construction funds:	
American River levees	$300,000
Cherry Valley Dam	785,000
Folsom Dam	4,150,000
Sacramento River:	
Old project	5,000,000
Major and minor tributaries	2,000,000
San Joaquin River levees	1,000,000
Success Dam	1,000,000
Subtotal	14,235,000
Advance planning funds:	
Black Butte Dam	100,000
New Hogan Dam	225,000
Terminus Dam	150,000
New Melones Dam	200,000
Middle Creek	75,000
Subtotal	750,000
Total	14,985,000

In order that my testimony before your committee will not be a repetition of that given by others, I will confine my remarks to the lower San Joaquin River project and the American River levee extension project.

LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER PROJECT

Levee and channel improvements on the San Joaquin River downstream from the mouth of the Merced River were authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 (Public Law 534, December 22, 1944, 78th Cong., 2d sess.). The required local cooperation for these improvements was authorized by the Legislature of the State of California in the Water Resources Act of 1945. Federal funds have been utilized to construct related projects but to this date no construction funds have been available for this unit of the adopted comprehensive plan for flood control in the San Joaquin Valley. The completion and near completion of related projects makes it possible for substantial flood-control protection to be provided by construction of certain units of the work authorized improvements at this time.

WORK PROPOSED FOR IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION

The work proposed for immediate completion consists of levee construction and bank protection between the mouth of the Merced and Stanislaus Rivers on the San Joaquin River and isolated bank revetment work below the Stanislaus. Upon completion of the New Melones Dam and Reservoir all units of the proposed improvements can be completed.

PRIVATE LEVEES INCLUDED IN AUTHORIZED PLAN

Private landowners in the delta and lower San Joaquin River have spent an estimated $32,900,000 on levees and flood-control works. A large proportion of these works will be incorporated in the authorized flood-control system for this area. In addition to the immediate protection provided by completing the proposed improvements at this time, the reloctaion and setback of existing levees, and the construction of adequate bank protection in critical reaches will conserve the investment in existing levees. Prompt construction in these critical areas augmenting the existing levee system will undoubtedly preclude the complete reconstruction of important reaches of levee. The frequently quoted schoolboy's adage, "A stitch in time saves nine," has by its use become hackneyed; nonetheless in respect to these improvements it is true.

The Legislature of the State of California has before it a plan to provide urgent flood protection and reclamation in the area upstream from the mouth of the Merced River. This plan is a modification of the authorized flowage easement acquisition required for this area as part of the lower San Joaquin project, and in no way affects the feasibility or practicality of commencing immediate construction of the works for which construction funds are hereby being requested.

It seems almost a certainty that this legislation will be enacted this year and that initial acquisition of rights-of-way leading to construction will start almost immediately upon entrance into the new fiscal year.

AREA PROTECTED

Generally, the levee and channel improvement project will provide urgently needed flood protection to approximately 140,000 acres and to the numerous commercial, public, and military installations; to the vital highway and railway transportation routes; and to a large and growing suburban area which is south of the city of Stockton.

Military installations

Within the area to be protected by the construction of these levees, the following military installations are located:

United States naval supply annex on Rough and Ready Island.
Sharpe general depot at Lathrop.
Sharpe general depot at Tracy Annex.
Sharpe general depot at Stockton.

In the floods of 1950–51, the breakdown of rail, highway, and communication systems seriously impaired the functioning of the military supply depots listed above. These depots combine to handle the greatest tonnage of any depot in the United States and represent a Federal investment of about $25 million.

Major public and private developments

Industrial and residential area west of Stockton
Suburban areas along U. S. 50
The Mossdale area (all transportation and communication services, including mainline railroads and highways, were cut off during the 1950 flood)
The San Joaquin County Hospital
The Deuel Vocational Institute, a $20 million investment
The Holly Sugar Corp.
Port of Stockton

The State of California has been experiencing a remarkable growth since 1940. The increase in population between 1940 and 1950 was more than 3,600,000 people. The population growth of California is continuing and has been expressed as the equivalent of a new city of 7,000 population each week. The area to be protected by these levees has been experiencing this same rapid growth and all indications point to its continuation.

Along with the industrial and commercial growth of this area the gains of agriculture have also been quite remarkable. Tabulated below are crop values in four of the counties traversed by the San Joaquin River, and farm income for California.

Crop value to farmer

County	Year 1951	Year 1941	Increase in 10 years
San Joaquin	$161,412,236	$56,414,130	$104,998,100
Stanislaus	127,048,452	35,953,644	91,094,810
Merced	117,580,856	34,834,750	82,746,110
Fresno	325,579,150	58,530,099	267,049,050
Total, 4 counties	731,620,700	185,732,620	545,888,080

Increase in 10 years is 294 percent of 1941 values.

Farm income for California

1946	$2,195,000,000	1950	$2,271,000,000
1947	2,151,000,000	1951	2,730,000,000
1948	2,133,000,000	1952	2,748,000,000
1949	2,068,000,000	1953	2,598,000,000

From these tabulations it can be seen that these four counties in the San Joaquin Valley produce a considerable share, approximately one-fourth of the total farm income of the State of California.

FLOOD DAMAGES

During the floods of 1950 and 1952 the area along the San Joaquin River below the mouth of the Merced River suffered severe damage. This damage approximated $4,700,000. Since 1950, as is prevalent throughout California, rapid urban and industrial growth has occurred in the area. I am informed that recent studies show that the project levees on the San Joaquin River, together with the storage reservoirs on the Stanislaus and Tuolumne Rivers, would at the present time prevent damages amounting to about $10,500,000 with a repetition of the 1950 flood under current conditions of development, and about $1,500,000 under similar conditions for the flood of 1952. For the conditions of the 1950 flood, about $5 million of damages would be prevented if the levee and bank revetment work were completed; for the 1952 conditions, about $900,000 of damages would be prevented. With the early completion of Cherry Valley Reservoir which, under its present schedule of construction, should provide flood protection commencing in 1956, the damages to be prevented by the levee work would probably be in the order of $7 million should the 1950 flood conditions be repeated, the balance of the estimated damages to be credited to the reservoirs authorized, but as yet unconstructed.

URGENT NECESSITY FOR IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION

The current rapid growth in population, agriculture, industry, property values, and other developments demands that immediate and sustained action be taken to provide protection commensurate with this ever-growing need. Floods looked upon a few years ago as merely a nuisance would be deemed today a major catastrophe due to growth in population and other developments.

EXTENSION OF LEVEES ON THE AMERICAN RIVER

This plan for completion of flood control on the American River is in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, which was authorized by act of Congress, 2d session, 1954, H. R. 9859.

This project authorizes the extension of approximately 7 miles of levees along the north bank of the American River that will protect an area comprising some 3,300 acres, part of which is presently developed into suburban homesites and the remainder is potentially in the same category. This community is situated to the east of the capital city of Sacramento and has been subjected to periodic flooding and will continue to be seriously menaced unless the levee work is completed at an early date.

This area, in the 1950–51 floods, suffered a flood damage of $3,400,000, of which $2,600,000 would have been saved, and the evacuation of 3,000 residents would have been unnecessary had the proposed levee construction been completed prior to this one flood season alone.

The total cost of this project is estimated to be $2,100,000, of which $1,600,000 will be the Federal Government's share and $500,000 the cost to the State of California. The necessary State expenditure has been included in the capital outlay budget of the reclamation board for the fiscal year 1955, and we urge the inclusion of $300,000 of Federal funds in order that construction may be initiated without delay.

The Sacramento River flood-control project, as originally planned in 1917, did not include the Folsom Dam and Reservoir as a unit of the overall plan. However, Congress, by Flood Control Act of December 1944, authorized the Folsom Dam as a multiple-purpose reservoir, namely, storage for irrigation, power, and flood control, with provisions for its operation for flood control in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of the Army.

Folsom Dam on the American River has reached completion. Under the operation of Folsom Reservoir for flood-control purposes, inflows into the reservoir will be stored. Releases up to, but not exceeding, 115,000 cubic feet per second will be the standard for flood-control operation.

When the rate of river flow reaches 60,000 to 70,000 cubic feet per second, water pours over the right bank of the American River. The proposed operation of Folsom Reservoir will require the release of quantities greater than 60,000 to 70,000 cubic feet per second at frequent intervals.

The phenomenal population increase in the last 15 years taking place in areas adjacent to the city of Sacramento has resulted in the vital necessity for increasing the degree of protection from flood menace to lands being rapidly converted from agriculture to urban use.

The legislature of the State of California has passed A. B. 1905 as emergency legislation. This bill authorizes and makes available State funds to match Federal funds for this work.

Mr. COHEN. I am a member of the State reclamation board. My reclamation board approves and supports all the items outlined by Mr. Hill of the water resources board, and especially all the items listed under the Sacramento Engineering District, which comes within the jurisdiction of our board.

To save your time I will omit naming the various items which appear in my statement and limit and confine myself to the San Joaquin River levees for which we ask $1 million in construction funds.

I may say, sir, there was nothing in the budget. This work qualifies under the criteria for new starts as it is directly related to the protection of industrial, urban, and military installations. The work that we are asking to be done will protect these as they are now threatened.

To mention only one of the projects that it would protect—the Sharpe general depot, which we are told handles the greatest military tonnage of any depot in the United States and represents a Federal obligation of over $25 million.

The existing levees on the San Joaquin were built by private interests and at their own cost and expense and they served their purpose fairly well up until about 10 years ago. As of now the stream has silted up to the extent that it does not have the carrying capacity. What happens, of course, is that the levees break and we are damaged by severe floods. Protecting the levees from erosion is beyond the power of the private individuals to do—when it comes to rock revetting these bad places.

For the past several years the executive budget has provided funds for the San Joaquin River levees. This year they did not. The Corps of Engineers have told us no longer than last April 26 that if funds are made available they can start construction work within 90 days—they can get going on the project, and they want to get the thing off of the ground.

In that connection, I would like to support the statements made by Congressman Leroy Johnson before your committee yesterday on the same subject, and also earnestly urge that the committee make funds available for this important project.

Secondly, I want to heartily endorse the item with regard to the American River levees for $300,000. There is an item in the budget of $90,000 for planning.

I would like also to support the statements made by Mr. Deterding and Mr. Lodi, who testified before me, and possibly Congressman Moss had something to say on this same subject.

I wish to thank you for hearing me.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Luther, who testified before you, testified to the effect that the Sacramento River flood-control project was the second oldest project of this kind in the history of our country.

Mr. COHEN. I believe that is right. I believe that the Mississippi River is first.

Mr. EVINS. It has been going a long time. You are asking for funds now that have not been budgeted to do some work in this area?

Mr. COHEN. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. How long has the work in the Sacramento River been in progress? How much has been done and how much remains to be done? I suppose it is a job that can never be done.

Mr. COHEN. I think that it can be completed.

The San Joaquin River is the second largest river in the State and we have never gotten a construction job started on it yet. I have been coming back here for 4 years now trying hard to get action, but so far, unfortunately, we have not gotten any.

Mr. HILL. Would you like to know what has been done and what has not been done on the Sacramento River project? I have it here.

Mr. EVINS. Insert it in the record.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Construction on original old project levees as of January 1954

	Miles	Percent
Levees in project, total	951.8	100.0
Levees constructed	937.5	98.5
Levees unconstructed	14.3	1.5
Substandard levees	154.8	16.3
Completed and accepted levees	525.0	55.2
Levees under construction	10.0	1.0
Standard levees (grade and section)	262.0	27.5
Levees with surfaced crown roadways	773.9	81.3
Levees with unsurfaced crown roadways	125.2	13.2
Levees without roadways	52.7	5.5

Estimated Federal cost (1955)	$64,400,000
Federal funds appropriated to date	50,611,500
Funds requested for fiscal year 1956	5,000,000
Funds required after fiscal year 1956	8,788,500

Construction initiated in 1917.

Status of project as of January 1, 1955

Construction plans and specifications are 80 percent complete. Construction is now about 76 percent complete. Completed major items includes 710 miles of levees, 5 weirs, 2 cutoff channels, 2 sets of outfall gates, clearing of about 1,800 acres of overflow channels and bypasses, considerable bank protection and flood channel dredging.

Current construction work contemplated for completion in fiscal year 1955 include levee construction and bank protection on the Feather River on the west levee from Rio Bonito station to Cox Ranch and on the Sacramento River east levee from Freeport to Georgiana Slough.

AMERICAN RIVER LEVEES

Mr. Moss. I would like to outline the problem we have on the American River levees which have been referred to by a number of previous witnesses.

We have a 7-mile stretch in the levee system that has not been constructed. It floods about every third year.

Mr. EVINS. Seven miles uncompleted? How many miles are there constructed?

Mr. Moss. For the overall flood-control project I do not know. There are several hundred miles that have been constructed, but this is on the American River and operating in connection with the Folsom Dam, which will be completed during the next year. A flood occurs there whenever it reaches a flow of about 70,000 second-feet. The dam is constructed to release during that peak flood period 115,000 second-feet, so we are going to continue to have the floods there until the levees are built. The flood in 1951 produced a damage of $3 million.

Mr. EVINS. Is the American River levee project budgeted?

Mr. Moss. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. For the $7 million?

Mr. Moss. It is budgeted. There is an appropriation recommended in the budget of $90,000. We are asking that it be increased to $300,000. The total cost is $1,200,000. The State of California last week approved through the legislature, and the Governor signed, authority for the State to participate to the extent of $500,000 in providing for pumping and relocation of highways and bridge extensions. It is an urgent project. We have a flood on that river about every three years. The $3 million loss of 3 years ago will be much greater next time because the area is one of the most rapidly expanding in the State.

In addition, I would like to urge the committee to support the request of the Bureau of Reclamation, the recommendation of the Budget Bureau for the final appropriation on Folsom Dam.

Then there is an item in the budget of $50,000 for further planning in connection with Black Butte Dam. We would like very much to see that increased to $100,000. I have a letter which I will include in my statement from the Corps of Engineers indicating that the $100,000 would permit them to finally determine location for that dam and it would put them on the road to a more detailed planning for recommendations to Congress.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington 25, D. C., March 9, 1955.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, Jr.
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOSS: On March 2 you asked that you be furnished late information on the Black Butte Reservoir.

The Black Butte Reservoir, to be located on Stony Creek, was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. It is now planned to have a total capacity of 160,000 acre-feet, of which 30,000 acre-feet would be allocated permanently to

irrigation while the remainder would be used seasonally for either irrigation or flood control.

The current estimated cost of the project is $15,500,000 and of this amount $101,000 has been allocated to date. It is currently estimated that an additional amount of $374,000, or a total of $475,000, would be required to bring the project to construction status. This is $24,000 higher than the figure given you verbally by Colonel Starbird. The difference is the sum necessary to complete cost allocation studies incident to firming up agreements for repayment.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1956, transmitted to the Congress on January 17, 1955, recommended $5 million nationwide for advance engineering and design of authorized projects. Of this amount a tentative allocation of $50,000 has been made to resume planning on Black Butte Reservoir. With this sum it is planned to establish definitely the site, and to complete the general design memorandum.

You asked whether or not a total of $100,000 might be economically spent in fiscal year 1956 if made available. It could be so spent. You asked also what additional planning might be accomplished with the increased sum. If $100,000 were received we would expect to fix the site, complete the general design memorandum, and accomplish a sizable portion of the detailed topographic survey and foundation drilling needed prior to the preparation of construction plans and specifications.

I hope the above will provide the information you require. Should it not, please call upon me for such additional information that you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert into the record a further statement on these projects.

AMERICAN RIVER LEVEES

Mr. Chairman, possibly the most important northern California flood-control project on which work has not started is the 7-mile-long levee on the American River upstream from the city of Sacramento.

This important flood-control levee was authorized by the last Congress. For the project to provide the flood protection necessary for the fast-growing residential and business section near Sacramento, this Congress should provide funds to complete planning and start construction.

To accomplish this objective, a congressional appropriation of $300,000 has been requested. Just the other day, California's Governor approved an appropriation bill passed by the California State Legislature to put up $500,000 as the State's share of the project. This money will be used to by rights-of-way.

Other local agencies, particularly the county of Sacramento, will spend from $500,000 to $800,000 additional on the project. This will be for relocating a major highway across the levee, installing pumping plants for drainage inside the levee, and correcting drainage canals. After construction the levee will be maintained and drainage facilities will be operated by other local agencies.

The American River levee is, in effect, the final job to make the Folsom project a fully operating flood-control project. Folsom Dam, which is part of the Central Valley project, is designed to release a maximum of 115,000 cubic feet of water per second under major flood conditions. The river downstream from the dam can handle only a maximum of 70,000 cubic feet per second unless the 7-mile section of American River levee is completed.

During the last major flood of the area in 1950–51, damage in excess of $3 million was done to the highly developed area to be protected by the new levee. Although there is $90,000 in the budget to finish planning for the levees, $300,000 could be used to get the project underway immediately.

FOLSOM DAM

The budget also includes funds to complete Folsom Dam and I am sure the committee will approve the appropriation of this money. The dam is part of a multipurpose project and is now over 90 percent complete. The initial powerplant already is in operation and irrigation water soon will be available for

water-deficient farmland in the area. The $4,150,000 appropriation in the budget will complete Folsom Dam.

BLACK BUTTE DAM

Planning funds also are included in the budget for Black Butte Dam, another important flood control and irrigation project in the Third Congressional District. So far, some $100,000 has been spent to plan this project and the appropriation of another $100,000 will permit completion of planning. Although $50,000 is included in the budget, the Army engineers report an appropriation of $100,000 will permit the selection of a final site for the project, completion of general design, and topographic maps and all other planning work before construction.

This project will control flood waters on Stony Creek which yearly adds its rain-swollen water to the Sacramento River and increases the great flood danger in the Sacramento Valley.

In addition, enough new water would be developed to irrigate some 30,000 acres in the upper Sacramento Valley.

To delay completion of planning for Black Butte Dam would waste the $100,000 already spent. It also would delay construction of a project which will help control floods and also provide irrigation water for an area which may soon experience an acute water shortage.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Moss.

CHERRY VALLEY PROJECT

Mr. HILL. I would like to call on Congressman Mailliard to make a statement.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I have no real statement to make, except to express my interest in an item that is included in the budget, $785,000 for the Cherry Valley project. This is, I believe, a unique project, the only one of its kind in the country in that the work is being done by the local citizens and the Federal Government has paid for those benefits which are of a flood-control nature.

My own interest is in San Francisco of which city I represent half. There are representatives here from each of the three agencies.

I want to express my interest and support, and to present Mr. Harry Lloyd, who is the manager of this project for the city and county of San Francisco.

Mr. LLOYD. My name is H. E. Lloyd. I have a statement that I would like to file for the record.

SAN JOAQUIN RIVER

Mr. EVINS. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY H. E. LLOYD

My name is Harry E. Lloyd. I am manager of the Hetch Hetchy water and power supply and chief engineer of the engineering bureau of the public utilities commission of the city and county of San Francisco, Calif. This commission, among other duties, has jurisdiction over the domestic water supply of the city.

I am appearing before you in the interest of that commission and in support of the program developed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for the control of floods along the lower San Joaquin River which originate on its principal tributary, the Tuolumne River and in particular, with regard to the construction of the Cherry Valley Dam in California.

As you gentlemen may know, the Hetch Hetchy project is on the Tuolumne River and is the principal source of domestic water for the city and county of San Francisco. The river is also the source of irrigation water for the 300,000

acres of farmlands within the confines of the Modesto and Turlock Irrigation Districts. These three agencies have spent close to $200 million in the development of the conservation features of the waters of the Tuolumne River and will expend additional sums as required in the future.

In 1940 the Corps of Engineers proposed the construction of a flood-control dam on the Tuolumne River, entirely at Government expense. Negotiations between the Corps of Engineers and local interests resulted in the program recommended in House Document No. 2 of the 78th Congress. This recommendation was accepted by the Congress and became part of Public Law 534, in December of 1944.

The law contemplates the use of 5 existing and 2 proposed reservoirs owned and operated by local interests for flood control as well as for conservation purposes. The reservoirs are to be operated for flood control in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

By contract No. DA-04-167 Eng.-38, certified September 26, 1949, between the United States of America and the city and county of San Francisco, Turlock Irrigation District and Modesto Irrigation District, the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army were set forth and the monetary value of the flood-control service to be performed by local interests, estimated at $12 million, was established.

Payment by the Federal Government is being made only for the flood-control benefits received. I wish to make it very clear to you gentlemen, that the Federal Government has not been asked for any money for conservation purposes.

Under the terms of the referenced contract, flood control is to be accomplished in three steps:

1. By December 1, 1949, operate existing facilities, owned by local interests, for flood control. These facilities have a storage capacity of 720,000 acre-feet.

2. By December 1, 1951, complete Cherry Valley Reservoir with a capacity of 260,000 acre-feet.

3. By December 1959, complete the new Don Pedro Reservoir with a capacity of 1,200,000 acre-feet.

The above schedules are contingent upon adequate financing, both Federal and local.

Local interests since December 1, 1949, have been operating their facilities in the interest of flood control in accordance with their contract obligations.

The facilities necessary to perform step 2 are now being constructed. The small size of the initial appropriations in 1948, 1949, and 1950 has delayed the completion date of step 2 until 1956 and added materially to the cost, which additional cost has been provided by the city and county of San Francisco. To date, and over a 7-year period, of the estimated Federal payment of $12 million to be made, $8,470,000 has been appropriated, of which $8,222,811 has been advanced to local interests.

By separate agreement between the Corps of Engineers and local interests the flood control provided under step 1 has a value of $4,600,000, and under combined steps 1 and 2 a value of $9 million. The remaining $3 million is allocated to the construction of the New Don Pedro Dam.

The value of this service as well as the necessity for step 2, namely, the building of Cherry Valley Dam, was demonstrated during the devastating floods of November and December of 1950.

The existing structures captured the November flood on the Tuolumne River, which reached a mean daily flow of 86,745 cubic feet per second on November 19, during which a controlled release was maintained below Don Pedro. A second mean daily peak of 47,474 cubic feet per second on December 4 was also controlled. However, by December 8, 1950, all of the existing Tuolumne River Reservoirs were full, and an uncontrolled flow of 64,500 cubic feet per second was discharged into the San Joaquin River.

It was this last flow which flooded the city of Modesto and contributed to the breaking of the San Joaquin levee system below the Mossdale Bridge, resulting in damage estimated by the Corps of Engineers at $5,746,000.

Studies developed by our engineers have demonstrated that had the Cherry Valley Dam been completed at that time, the maximum flow reaching the San Joaquin River from the Tuolumne River would not have exceeded 12,000 cubic feet per second.

The Cherry Valley Dam, for which the final Federal appropriation is being requested, will be completed and in operation during the fiscal year 1955-56, thus making available an additional 270,000 acre-feet of storage capacity on the river.

As stated previously, this project differs from most of the others before you in that local interests are building the necessary structures and are providing all of the money necessary for the construction of the various features of the project in excess of the value of flood-control services.

Our contract with the Federal Government provides that city and Federal funds be spent on a pro rata basis of the estimated $14,200,000 cost of step 2 of the project now under construction.

Dams and reservoirs, owned by local interests, and now being used under step 1 of this project, could not be built for less than $50 million at this time.

The total Federal payment to local interests for the flood control service provided in the structures built or building, under steps 1 and 2 above, is estimated at $9 million.

Funds expended or committed to date

Preliminary surveys and planning		$198,000
Construction completed:		
Access roads	$1,135,500	
Power and communication	119,000	
Camp at dam site	237,100	
Diversion tunnel and foundation excavation	1,400,000	
Dam embankment	3,451,000	
		6,342,600
Construction in progress:		
Dam embankment	3,785,500	
Outlet valves	217,000	
Spillway and control works	825,000	
		4,827,500
Engineering and general expense		915,400
Total		12,283,500

Additional funds to be expended or committed prior to June 30, 1956

Service road	$30,000
Reservoir clearing	500,000
Cherry-Eleanor tunnel	1,050,000
Stream-gaging station	20,000
Engineering and general expense	200,000
Contingencies and miscellaneous	116,500
Total	1,916,500
Total funds expended or to be committed prior to June 30, 1956	14,200,000
Project expense for Corps of Engineers	255,000
Total cost	14,455,000
Financed from city funds	5,200,000
Estimated total Federal cost	9,255,000
Appropriated to date	8,470,000
Federal appropriation requested	785,0000

I am informed that on recommendation of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended an appropriation of $785,000 for this project for the forthcoming fiscal year. The city of San Francisco as the constructing agency in this case, concurs in the recommendation and urges this committee to allow the full amount recommended in the Budget.

This is the final appropriation of Federal funds required to finance steps 1 and 2 of the contract between the Federal Government and local interests for the control of floods on the lower San Joaquin River and will complete the Cherry Valley Dam under step 2 thereof.

Gentlemen, as this will be my final appearance before your committee in connection with the Cherry Valley Dam, may I state that much favorable comment has been received regarding the project throughout the years. Here we have a project that has been developed with the fullest cooperation of the Federal Government, a large metropolitan area, and extensive agricultural areas in California.

I want to express my personal appreciation, and that of the city and county of San Francisco, for the courteous and understanding reception the city's representatives have had before the committee each year since 1948.

I thank this committee most sincerely for its kind attention.

Mr. LLOYD. I am manager and chief engineer of the Hetch Hetchy water supply of the city and county of San Francisco. I am appearing here at the direction of the public utilities commission of the city of San Francisco, which body, among other duties, controls the water supply of the city.

I also want to support the program developed by the Corps of Engineers in 1938, which was later authorized under the flood-control bill of 1944, wherein, as Congressman Milliard has stated, the corps and Federal Government was to participate in the financing of this project only insofar as flood-control benefits were concerned. The local agencies were and are building the project and are supplying all the other plans necessary for it.

Briefly outlined, the project is divided into 3 stages, the first one of which the local interest agreed to operating their existing facilities which consisted of 5 reservoirs, in accordance with plans and rules and regulations prescribed by the Corps of Engineers, and the second step was to construct an additional reservoir which is the subject of this particular legislation at this time, namely, the Cherry River Reservoir.

The purposes of this project is to prevent the devastating floods from the Tuolumne River upon which San Francisco depends for its immense water supply coming down into the San Joaquin and contributing toward the devastation in areas such as Mr. Cohen was just speaking about.

This project has been under construction, and will be completed this year—the Cherry River phase of the project—and we are here at this time asking that the final appropriation of $785,000 to be made.

I am informed that the Corps of Engineers has recommended that amount. It is in the budget. That will complete the second phase of this development.

There are two gentlemen here representing the Turlock Irrigation District and the Modesto Irrigation District who would like to testify. There is full cooperation between the Federal Government and a large metropolitan area, and two of the largest agricultural areas in the United States all working cooperatively on the development.

This will be, I should say, our final appearance before the committee in connection with the Cherry River Valley Dam. I may say there is much favorable comment about this project throughout the Nation.

I want to express my personal appreciation on behalf of the city and county of San Francisco for the courteous treatment we have received in coming here. I thank you most sincerely for all that this committee and its predecessors have done in this regard and urge that the full amount as recommended in the budget be appropriated this time.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Lloyd. While I have not been here all along, I am sure that you have done valiant work for your county and district in appearing before the committee. You indicated that you will not be coming back any more. I am sure we will miss not seeing you.

CHERRY VALLEY DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be glad to hear the statement of Congressman John F. Shelley.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am here today on my annual quest for approval of funds to complete the Cherry Valley Dam and Reservoir with the necessary additional construction features to provide water for the city of San Francisco and to control floods along the Tuolumne and San Joaquin Rivers. I am happy to say that this will be my last appearance before the subcommittee for this particular purpose, since the $785,000 approved by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal 1956 will, when appropriated, be the final payment to fulfill the Federal Government's obligation on the Cherry Valley project.

As the members of the subcommittee know, the Cherry Valley project is unusual in that construction was not undertaken by the Corps of Engineers. The contracts were let by the city after the Federal Government had obligated itself, through Public Law 534 of the 78th Congress, to repay to San Francisco that portion of costs determined to be the value of the flood-control features of the project. The Government's share of the total cost has been set at $9,255,000. The $785,000 to be appropriated for fiscal 1956 will be the last installment on that obligation, and will permit completion of the last phases of the project during the coming fiscal year.

It is unfortunate that the delay in appropriating sufficient funds in the early phases of the project construction prevented completion of the water storage facilities in time to prevent flood damage during the late 1940's and early 1950's; however, the worth of the project from the flood-control standpoint has been well demonstrated since that time in that it has permitted impounding sufficient Tuolumne River water during flood periods to prevent a repetition of the lower valley floods since that time. I know that the people of the area are grateful to the subcommittee for the fine cooperation given the city of San Francisco in recent years which has permitted uninterrupted progress in construction, and the city itself is looking forward to completion of the connecting water systems so that we may enjoy the full benefits of the reserve water supply which the project assures to us.

Mr. Chairman, for myself and for San Francisco I want to thank you and the members of the subcommittee for your understanding and cooperation on this project in past years and to express the earnest hope that you will again do the needful by approving the city's request for funds to compete the Cherry Valley project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Shelley.

TUOLUMNE RIVER, CALIF.

Mr. HILL. The next witness is Mr. Abner M. Crowell.

Mr. CROWELL. My name is Abner M. Crowell, president of the board of directors of the Turlock Irrigation District. I have a prepared statement.

Mr. EVINS. It will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF ABNER M. CROWELL

My name is Abner Crowell and I am president of the board of directors of the Turlock Irrigation District in Stanislaus and Merced Counties, Calif. The Turlock Irrigation District supplies irrigation water to an area of 168,000 acres in diversified crops and generates and distributes power within the area. Our canals, dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission and distribution lines, substations, pumps, and structures have been financed by general obligation bonds and direct taxes on the land since the organization of the district in 1887.

The Turlock Irrigation District, the Modesto Irrigation District, and the city and county of San Francisco under a contract with the United States of America dated August 29, 1949, are obligated to operate their existing storage reservoirs in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army in order to obtain immediately a degree of control over Tuolumne River floods. In the comprehensive plan of development of the Tuolumne River the Government pays for flood-control benefits only.

The Cherry Valley Reservoir is expected to be completed and in operation by 1956. Completion of the Cherry Valley Reservoir will provide 268,000 acre-feet of additional storage on the river and make possible an economical power development below the dam. This power is now needed to meet the growing demands of the city of San Francisco and the districts. The final project of the comprehensive plan of Tuolumne River development, the New Don Pedro Dam, as provided in the agreement of June 30, 1949, between the districts and the city and county of San Francisco will be started about 1960 and with its completion the Tuolumne River will be fully regulated by the five reservoirs owned and operated by the irrigation districts and the city and county of San Francisco. Surveys have just been completed indicating that a storage capacity of 1,952,000 acre-feet will be provided by the proposed New Don Pedro Dam, 515 feet high.

Large storage capacity on the river will result in a regulated annual release of about 1.6 million acre-feet as compared with a dry year natural runoff of 600,000 acre-feet and a wet year natural runoff of 5 million acre-feet. Flood flow peaks of 100,000 second-feet will be reduced to 7,000 second-feet at the San Joaquin River. This means a maximum use of the Tuolumne River for domestic water supply, irrigation, flood control, and electric power.

The construction of the Cherry Valley Dam is under the jurisdiction of the city and county of San Francisco and details of expenditures made to date and to be made are being filed before the committee by the Public Utilities Commission of the city and county of San Francisco.

We earnestly hope that the final appropriation of $785,000 will be made available so that the project will be completed next year. I wish to thank you for the consideration which your committee has always extended to the irrigation districts.

Mr. CROWELL. I would like to concur in what Mr. Lloyd has said. We in the Turlock district have been very happy to be a party to this overall agreement with the Federal Government in rendering a flood-control service to them. We have been using our project for flood control since 1949. We are most happy to conclude the building of Cherry Dam.

Mr. Lloyd said that this would probably be his last appearance. Perhaps we should say temporarily. I will go along with that.

I want to say to the committee that we have enjoyed working with you. We appreciate what you have done. Rather than having appropriations turned down, we would like to come back and pay a visit. We do request the amount in the present President's budget of $785,000 be granted this year.

Mr. HILL. Our next witness is Mr. Milton L. Kidd, a member of the board of directors of the Modesto Irrigation District.

Mr. KIDD. My name is Milton L. Kidd, and I have a prepared statement.

Mr. EVINS. The statement will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MILTON L. KIDD RELATING TO FLOOD CONTROL ON THE TUOLUMNE RIVER IN CALIFORNIA

My name is Milton L. Kidd. I am a member of the board of directors of the Modesto Irrigation District and have served in that capacity for over 20 years and in February was relected to that position again for the sixth 4-year term.

In 1944, the 78th Congress, 2d session, adopted Public Law No. 534, authorizing flood control upon the lower San Joaquin River and its tributaries, including the Tuolumne River.

In accordance with this law a comprehensive plan was developed for the control of floodwaters in the two rivers I have just named.

This was divided into three parts—the first was for the districts to operate their existing reservoirs for flood control in addition to their conservation features. The second was for the construction of Cherry Valley Dam and Reservoir and the third part was for the construction of New Don Pedro Dam and Reservoir.

In August of 1949, the Turlock and Modesto Irrigation Districts and the city and county of San Francisco entered into a contract with the United States of America to operate their facilities on the Tuolumne River for flood control and to construct additional facilities to assist in this respect. Cherry Valley Dam and Reservoir was one of these. The city and county of San Francisco voted $4 million in bonds to pay for their share of this dam.

I have been appearing before this committee each year in regard to the annual appropriations for this dam. It appears that this portion of the project can be completed and in operation during 1956 if an appropriation of $785,000 is made for this purpose.

We call to your attention that the irrigation districts have been operating their reservoirs now for a number of years to give some flood-control protection to the Tuolumne and lower San Joaquin Rivers. This has not been without some risks to their own water supply. Completion of this dam during the coming year would alleviate this and also give added flood-control protection.

Completion of this dam would place in operation the second phase of the flood-control program for the Tuolumne River.

The third and final phase of the comprehensive plan will be when the New Don Pedro Dam and Reservoir is built. The irrigation districts have already had aerial surveys and reservoir capacity studies made and will have a geology report within the next 2 months. All this is being done at their own expense.

We appreciate the past courtesies of your committees and would more than welcome an appropriation this year of sufficient size to complete the Federal Government's contribution toward Cherry Valley Dam.

Mr. KIDD. The people of my district are tremendously satisfied and pleased with the way that Congress has accepted our presentations here. Even though we are 4 years behind on the original agreement under which we began to work with the Army engineers, we are completing this year the second phase of this program on the river.

I am not even referring to not coming back because, like Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Crowell, we will be interested in the third phase, which is an even greater project, and under which there are contractual agreements between the Army engineers, the city of San Francisco, and the agricultural area that I represent.

We shall work on that project and get it completed sometime in the not too distant future. Again may I express to you our sincere appreciation for the way you have received our projects in the past. I will return with the full knowledge we will get good consideration in the times ahead.

Mr. HILL. Our next witness is Congressman Scudder, speaking for the Middle Creek project in his district.

Mr. EVINS. I think that Congressman Scudder has been before this Appropriations Committee at least three times this session. I for-

merly served on a committee with him and he visited my area in Tennessee. I understood that you represented the northern district of California and now you are representing this central section?

MIDDLE CREEK FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECT

Mr. SCUDDER. That is not quite correct. This is still in the northern part of the State of California.

Mr. Chairman, I am Congressman Hubert B. Scudder, representing the First Congressional District of California, and am appearing today in the interest of the Middle Creek flood-control project located near the community of Upper Lake, Lake County, Calif.

Last year I introduced a bill (H. R. 9024) to authorize works of flood control on Middle Creek substantially in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers as printed in House Document 367, 81st Congress.

The project was adopted and authorized under "Title II: Flood control," of Public Law 780, 83d Congress, at an estimated Federal cost of $1,110,000. Non-Federal costs are estimated at $790,000.

As computed by the Army Corps of Engineers, the benefit-cost ratio of this project is about 1.7 to 1.

The units of the authorized project covered in the Federal cost comprise the improvement of 1.1 miles of existing levee and construction of 0.2 mile of new levee on the left bank of Middle Creek between Clear Lake and Scott Creek; the construction of levees on both banks and improvement of the channel of Middle Creek for a distance of 3.6 miles upstream from Scott Creek; the construction of a levee along the left bank of Scott Creek extending 1.3 miles upstream from its confluence with Middle Creek; the construction of a weir across Clover Creek below the mouth of Alley Creek to limit the flow therein to its present channel capacity; and the construction of a leveed bypass channel extending for a distance about 0.8 mile from the proposed weir on Clover Creek to Middle Creek.

The non-Federal obligation includes the estimated costs for the acquisition of approximately 430 acres of rights of way and flowage easements; the relocation of 0.5 mile of State highway and 0.4 mile of county road; and reconstruction or replacement of 7 bridges, including 1 on a State highway, 4 on secondary roads, and 2 on farm access roads; and the relocation of 2 buildings.

The project will afford protection to an area of some 2,700 acres of highly developed agricultural lands located along the lower reaches of Middle, Scott, and Clover Creeks—as well as providing needed protection to the community of Upper Lake which is situated on both banks of Clover Creek downstream from the proposed control weir.

The community of Upper Lake is partially flooded at an average frequency of 3 times per year and almost the entire town is flooded once in 10 years.

It is estimated that a recurrence of the 1937 flood on Middle Creek, under present conditions, would cause damages in the amount of $800,000. The recurring flood conditions and resultant damage to property and structures would be prevented by the recommended improvements.

The Lake County Board of Supervisors, by resolution dated January 21, 1955, requested the California State Water Resources Board

to investigate the project and make recommendations on the same. A favorable report was issued and, on March 4, 1955, was formally approved by the State board. In brief, the report finds the project economically feasible on the basis of estimated costs, and stresses its immediate need for the reasons of flood control. The findings and conclusions of the State water resources board have been approved by the California State engineer, and legislation authorizing local participation has been introduced in the State legislature.

In March of this year I discussed this project with the Corps of Engineers, and was advised that it is eligible for planning money. From information I have obtained, both from the Corps of Engineers and the California State Water Resources Board, the funds necessary for planning would be from $70,000 to $75,000.

Therefore, owing to the necessity of the Middle Creek project from the standpoint of flood control, I respectfully urge this committee to give favorable consideration to this request and recommend the inclusion of planning funds in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1956.

As you know, this is a project that will be supported by Federal, State, and local money. We will appreciate very much the consideration of the committee for the opportunity of bringing this to a planning stage where we can see some future in the reclamation project.

I appreciate very much the time that you have given me.

SUCCESS DAM FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT—TERMINUS DAM FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

Mr. HILL. Congresman Hagen appeared this morning. I have Mr. Alexander here, engineer and manager of the Lower Tule River Irrigation District.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I am W. A. Alexander, registered civil engineer and chief engineer and manager of the Lower Tule River Irrigation District.

I have a statement here that I would like to file with the committee.

Mr. EVINS. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF W. A. ALEXANDER

I am W. A. Alexander, of Porterville, Calif., chief engineer and manager of the Lower Tule River Irrigation District, requesting funds for Success and Terminus Dams. I am appearing along with Raymond Williams, of Porterville, chairman of the Tule River Flood Control Association, in behalf of the following organizations who are requesting an appropriation for the construction of Success Dam, and have resolutions which may be filed with the committee authorizing our appearance here. They are:

County of Tulare
Lower Tule River Irrigation District
Woodville Chamber of Commerce
Porterville Chamber of Commerce
Pioneer Ditch Co.
City of Porterville
Tule River Riparianists Association
Tulare County Water Commission
Porterville Irrigation District

On behalf of Terminus Dam I am representing Tulare County, Kaweah-Delta Conservation District, Tulare County Water Commission, and the city of Visalia. I have resolutions which I will file with the committee showing my authorization.

All of these organizations and the people whom they represent—city, urban, and farm population—are in the direct flood plain of these two rivers. They have been seriously damaged by floods in the past and due to the increased populations in the city and urban areas and increased development of rich agricultural land lying along and adjacent to these stream systems, the potential flood damage becomes greater with each year that these rivers are left uncontrolled with a serious flood threat at all times.

The proposed Terminus and Success Dams are to be located on the Kaweah and Tule River, respectively, in Tulare County, Calif. The construction of these dams will complete the coordinated flood-control plan authorized by Congress in 1944 for Kings, Kern, Kaweah, and Tule Rivers. This plan is for the prevention of flood damages from all four rivers to public roads, bridges, fertile developed agricultural lands, the urban and city property located along the rivers, and the protection of the rich agricultural land in Tulare Lake Basin.

The job is now two-thirds completed. Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River and Isabella Dam on the Kern River have been constructed at a cost of $63 million. We urgently request that the committee continue the orderly development of this coordinated flood-control project by recommending and supporting the request for necessary funds to commence work on Success and Terminus Dams.

The estimated cost of Success and Terminus Dams is $29 million, of which approximately $700,000 has been expended to date in planning by the Army engineers. We urge your committee to consider an appropriation of $1 million to complete the advance planning on Success Dam and commence construction. The advance planning, including allocation of irrigation benefits for Success Dam, would require $110,000. The additional money would be used to acquire rights-of-way, relocation of facilities, and commence a portion of construction during this fiscal year.

In regard to Terminus Dam, it is requested that your committee allocate $150,000 to complete the advance planning along with the allocation study to determine irrigation benefits.

The development of farmlands along these streams is increasing each year and the potential flood damage becomes greater as each year passes with uncontrolled runoff. Floods on these streams are not only a financial loss to the individual property owners, but a financial loss to the economy of the United States. There is also a direct loss in income tax revenue to the Federal Treasury. Sound economics call for the construction of these dams immediately.

Local interests have taken all measures within their means to solve the problem but without success. They have done channel rectification, cleaning, and formed levee districts and private individuals along these rivers have constructed their own levees and cleared channels, but are unable to cope with the situation without help.

The following is a brief history of the actual conditions on each project:

SUCCESS DAM FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, TULE RIVER, TULARE COUNTY, CALIF.

The construction of Success Dam was authorized and approved by Congress in Public Law 534, 78th Congress, 2d session, H. R. 4485, adopted the 22d day of December 1944.

The purpose of this project is to provide flood control protection for (1) the city of Porterville and surrounding urban areas; (2) thousands of acres of rich agricultural lands along the Tule River and in Tulare Lake Basin; and (3) State and county roads and bridges.

The city of Porterville is situated approximately 5 miles west and downstream from the proposed Success Dam site, adjacent to the Tule River which flows along the south side of the city. Porter Slough is a branch of the Tule River which flows directly through the center of the city. The city of Porterville and the urban areas surrounding the city have been repeatedly subjected to floods from high flows in the Tule River and Porter Slough.

The course of the Tule River upon leaving Porterville is in a westerly direction, and it divides into several channels traveling for a distance of approximately 36 miles before it terminates in the Tulare Lake Basin. The river in its several channels throughout this 36-mile stretch flows through highly productive farmland which has been subjected to periodic floodings during high stages of the river. This has caused untold damage to growing crops as well as damage to the land, making it necessary for rehabilitation after the flood to be able to farm the same again.

Floodwaters from the Tule River reaching the Tulare Lake Basin have caused flood damage resulting in millions of dollars to rich agricultural land located in the basin. In addition to the above, there has been considerable damage to county roads and loss of bridges located along the Tule River.

The property owners and residents of this area have been in need of this project for many years in order to protect their lands and property. The Army engineers completed their necessary preliminary surveys and made a report on the feasibility of this project, which was approved and authorized by Congress in 1944. The people at that time had hopes that the project would be built immediately, and they would no longer be subject to devastating and damaging floods of this river.

For the past 11 years repeated requests have been made to the Congress for funds to build this project. Local interests and farmers have expended large sums of money for levee work, head gates, and bank protection in order to protect their property along the river. Farmers in the flood plain, together with the county, have cleaned the river channels and increased height of levees which gives only temporary relief. Many thousands of dollars have been spent by individuals trying to help themselves in protecting their property. Farmers in and around Tulare Lake Basin have spent millions of dollars in levee work and drainage systems to protect their property and farmlands. All of this work does not, and cannot, solve the flood problem along the river and the only solution is a flood-control dam.

Damaging floods on the Tule River occurring in recent years were in 1938, 1943, 1945, and 1950.

The flash flood of 1950 caused a break in the levee just east of Porterville on the main river and also breeched a secondary levee formed by the railroad track enbankment. Sandbagging and other emergency work, along with the river rapidly receding, saved the city of Porterville and urban area of approximately 14,000 population, from serious flooding and millions of dollars in damage to property. This may occur at any time and cannot be controlled with any degree of safety unless Success Dam is in operation. The overall historical damage caused by the 1950 flood was $1,400,000.

Flood flows in the Lower Tule River Irrigation District, both in 1938 and 1943, covered in excess of 35,000 acres. Tulare County, as a result of the November 1950 flood on Tule River, had to reconstruct several bridges which were destroyed by the flood and expend many thousands of dollars on repairing county roads which were damaged. Farmers and property owners along the river immediately after each flood have expended large sums of money in repairing levees, cleaning out river channels, and replacing headwaters for irrigation diversion structures which are destroyed or damaged.

TERMINUS DAM FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, KAWEAH RIVER, TULARE COUNTY, CALIF.

The proposed Terminus Dam site is located on the Kaweah River, 20 miles in Public Law 534, 78th Congress, 2d session, H. R. 4485, adopted the 22d day of December 1944.

The proposed Terminus Dam site is located on the Kaweah River, 20 miles east of the city of Visalia, the county seat of Tulare County, Calif. The drainage area of the Kaweah River is in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and comprises approximately 520 square miles. The average annual runoff is 420,000 acre-feet with a maximum runoff year in excess of 1,100,000 acre-feet. The Kaweah River divides into several channels upon leaving the foothills on the easterly side of the San Joaquin Valley and runs in a westerly direction approximately 60 miles where the channels converge and empty into Tulare Lake Basin.

The purpose of this dam would be to control the damaging floodwaters of the Kaweah River which have in the past caused damage to the city of Visalia and urban area with a population of approximately 18,000, the rich agricultural land in the Kaweah delta area, and the Tulare Lake Basin.

When in flood stage, the Kaweah River and its branches cause extensive damage to many thousands of acres of highly productive agricultural lands. The results in direct crop loss to the farmer and loss in income to the Nation, and extensive costs to individuals in rehabilitating their land and property after each flood. Irrigation diversion works are destroyed or damaged along with bridges, county roads, and irrigation wells.

The cities of Visalia, Woodlake, and the town of Farmersville have been inundated during flood stages of the river and in recent years the damage has been extremely heavy. The damage to the Tulare Lake Basin, into which flood-

waters from this stream empty along with the Tule, Kern, and Kings Rivers, is to the rich agricultural land in excess of 180,000 acres. There is no outlet to this basin and water keeps land out of production until it evaporates or can be used for irrigation on lands which are not flooded.

The Tulare Lake Basin estimate of flood damage in the spring of 1952 was $8,305,610 from the combined flow of the Kaweah, Tule, Kings, and Kern Rivers. These are direct damages of gross crop loss, levee building costs, and damage to land. The Kaweah and Tule Rivers contributed over one-third of the flood-water which caused the damage.

The local interests along the Kaweah River and its tributaries have expended large sums of money on levees to attempt to control the floods. These have not proven adequate and resulted in damage to farmlands as well as the city of Visalia on numerous occasions. The flood which occurred February 2, 1945, caused an estimated damage of $1 million to the city of Visalia alone.

This flood damage, together with the damage along the rivers, conclusively shows that a flood-control dam on the Kaweah River is a sound economic investment for the United States.

SUMMARY

The overall damages for the Kaweah River flood of February 2, 1945, are estimated at $1,390,000, and on the Tule River at $3 million. The same type of floods occurring today could possibly double the monetary damage due to the increased population of the cities of Visalia and Porterville during the past 10 years, together with an approximate 50 percent increase in the development of agricultural land in these areas.

Because of the costly past experience of the county of Tulare in repairing and rebuilding bridges and highways, the property damages to the cities of Visalia and Porterville, general damages to fertile developed agricultural land, and loss of livestock due to floods from the Kaweah and Tule Rivers, with the growing potential damage due to increased population and agricultural development at the present time, we earnestly request your committee to consider and approve an appropriation for Success and Terminus Dams.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have resolutions here supporting these two projects, the Success project and the Terminus project. I would like to file the list of these resolutions in the record at this point.

Mr. EVINS. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The resolutions referred to are as follows:)

LIST OF RESOLUTIONS SUPPORTING SUCCESS PROJECT AND TERMINUS PROJECT

SUCCESS

Porterville Irrigation District
Tulare County Water Commission
Lower Tule River Irrigation District
Tule River Riparianist
City of Porterville
Porterville Chamber of Commerce
Woodville Chamber of Commerce
Board of Supervisors of Tulare County

TERMINUS

Tulare County Board of Supervisors
City of Visulia
Tulare County Water Commission
Kaweah Delta Conservation District

The Success and Terminus projects were authorized in the 1944 Flood Control Act.

Mr. EVINS. May I interrupt you a moment? The gentleman who testified yesterday made a strong statement against the Success Dam. Congressman Hagen testified this morning making an equally strong or a stronger statement in support of it. Will you tell the committee

why the project should be approved, and if so, give us briefly what is needed. There is opposition and proponents for it. The Congressman made a fine statement in behalf of it. Tell us in your own words why it is needed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will be very happy to do so. I would like to put this map in front of you so that you can get a better picture of the situation.

To orient you, the city of Porterville is located here [indicating] in the center of this map. The drainage area of the Tule River is where my pencil runs around the heavy black line. The Success Dam site is located here 4 or 5 miles east of the city of Porterville.

The purpose of this dam would be to protect the city of Porterville, which has a population of around 14,000 within the city and immediate suburban areas. Then immediately below the city of Porterville you have the Porterville Irrigation District with 16,000 acres of valuable irrigable land, and it is also shown on this map.

Going below that we have the lower Tule River Irrigation District that extends for a distance of 18 or 20 miles along the Tule River, which has within its boundaries and subject to flooding about 35,000 to 40,000 acres of very valuable irrigable land. At the terminus of his point the water would dump into the Tuolumne Lake.

Going back upstream to the point of the dam, the opposition has developed at the dam site. There are 2,000 acres of land that have to be taken to build the dam. Of that 2,000 acres about 200 are under irrigation and cultivation. The rest is dry pastureland and it is used for grazing.

Mr. EVINS. And it is your position that in building the dam you will cover 2,000 acres of land, but you will save the lives of a lot of people and the city below the dam site?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is correct. You will save a lot of valuable irrigable property. Whenever there are floods we lose crops down there. The farmers have to spend several hundreds of dollars to put the land back into production.

Mr. EVINS. Is this the low alluvial land below and the mountainous and hilly land above?

Mr. ALEXANDER. This is all mountainous land up here. The Tule River drainage area contains about——

Mr. EVINS. Have you had repeated floods in the area of Porterville?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And the dam is needed?

Mr. ALEXANDER. We have repeated floods there. We had floods in 1937, 1943, and the 1950 flood was the last flood. I have pictures here that will show you the evidence. Each number on the picture refers to a number on the map and it will show you evidence of what the flood has done.

Mr. EVINS. What does that 481 mean?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is the number of this picture. These pictures will show you what the 1950 flood did in our particular area.

Mr. EVINS. Was there any loss of life?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; no particular loss of life that I know of.

Mr. EVINS. What would be the estimated damages caused by one of these floods?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think the 1950 flood was $1,400,000. If the same flood occurred today, due to the increased development, the Army engineers estimate that it would be $1,750,000.

Mr. EVINS. Are there any Federal installations in this area to be protected?

Mr. ALEXANDER. There is no Federal property. We have a State hospital located in this area [indicating].

Mr. EVINS. How is the water used after it reaches Tuolumne Lake?

Mr. ALEXANDER. After it reaches the lake, a good portion of it evaporates because it spreads over a wide area and you have extreme temperatures during the summer. The rest is pumped out whenever they can get to it and put on the land surrounding for irrigation.

Mr. EVINS. It is intended only for flood-control purposes at this time?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Flood-control purposes at this time. There will be incidental benefits from irrigation.

Mr. EVINS. You feel as an engineer the dam can be justified on the flood-control basis alone?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes, I do.

Mr. EVINS. It is your view that the vast majority of the people in the area favor this project?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It is my view that they do. I have lived in the surrounding areas for the past 10 years. The majority of the people are in favor of the project.

Mr. HAND. Where are most of the people located who appear to oppose the site?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Killian, who appeared here, is clear up on the north fork [indicating].

Mr. HAND. He said that he was. There are a large number of people below the dam site. Where would they be?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Scattered from one end to the other.

Mr. HAND. Is there any settlement in through here [indicating on the map]?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes; there is a settlement up here of some orange groves and so forth. They will not be flooded by the dam site, but they adjoined their neighbors. They have lived side by side for years. For sentimental reasons these people at the dam site do not want to give their land up. The people up here are at a little town of Springfield and they are supporting the opposition.

Mr. HAND. Where will this water go if not dammed normally?

Mr. ALEXANDER. If flooded it goes into the Tuolumne Lake Basin. If you will look at the other pictures, you will see that the Army engineers have completed a dam on the Kings River that empties into the Tuolumne Basin. They have completed a dam on the Kern River which empties into the basin. These are the other two major streams that flood this lake basin, as well as the land that lies along the stream. You have plugged up two holes in the bucket but you still have two open.

Mr. HAND. Is it possible to divert this water from this present use?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No. It is a water-deficient area below the dam as far as irrigation is concerned, except at flood times. We are importing now approximately 170,000 to 200,000 acre-feet a year into this area to take care of this valuable agricultural land.

Mr. HAND. Is there any fear that the State of California or any other local government will be able to divert this water to some other area from which it now normally flows?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have no fear of that myself. Every one of these streams in the valley in California, in that particular area, have more filings on them than there is water available for appropriation. The idea in that area is not to divert; but to bring more water in for irrigation purposes. The idea for the dam for flood-control purposes is to take care of it in those years when we have high flow and to stop this tremendous damage that it does along the river.

Mr. MURRAY. What is the principal reason for the objections?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, the principal reason, to start with, was that at the reservoir site the farmers there naturally did not want to give up the land. They started out and enlisted the support of the upstream people to some extent, and they finally got it worked around where they formed all the drainage area into a soil-conservation district just this year. They have told the people in the upper area to form a soil conservation district and you can get in some small upstream dams up there so that you people can come in and get some water to take care of the land. There are irrigated only 3,500 acres that are being farmed to agriculture of the 250,000 acres. The rest is hills and forest land and drainage. That is what they told them. The men in that area are naturally interested in getting some small dams put in there for doing a little patch irrigation and having water for their stock. They have tried to convince them that would be ideal: to put the small dams in and eliminate the big dam, so that it would not flood their ground down here. Small dams have been investigated by the Army engineers, by the State of California, and by the Bureau of Reclamation. They have investigated the entire watershed in there. They have all agreed the Success Dam site was a proper site and the best site upon which to build a dam. We would get the most from our dollar invested for flood control from that one dam. They have four other sites. They said that any combination of the other four, or any individual one of the other four, would not give the protection that this dam would.

Mr. EVINS. It seems that the name of your dam is a proper one—Success. From my own experience in my area down south, you will find some property owners who will register objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I might make another statement. Before flood control conference in California and before the State water resources board the same opposition has appeared. They have reviewed it thoroughly with the people and gone over it, and they have gone on record along with other projects here of recommending a $1 million appropriation for the Success Dam, to complete the investigation and go ahead with the construction.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Alexander. You have given us a fine statement.

LOWER TULE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. HILL. Our next witness is Mr. Ray Williams, representing the lower Tule River Irrigation District.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not have a prepared statement. I come here as a property owner and as a taxpayer and I am in the direct course of the flood. I have a picture of the river where it comes out. We have

had four floods on this property. Here is what happened during one of those floods [showing pictures].

We have to repair that damage. The land is very valuable agricultural land. Up to the present time we have not been able to get any public assistance. We have taken care of 3 miles of levee there ourselves—my brother and I. We have spent in excess of $100,000 in the last four floods protecting our own property. We are able in our business to take care of ourselves, but there are a lot of little farmers in there that during the 1950 flood lost their entire crops.

Mr. EVINS. You are a vegetable gardener and a truck farmer?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I raise asparagus and peaches of the finest kind.

Mr. EVINS. And you are testifying to substantial recurring floods and damage?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There have been four damaging floods to us and our neighbors there since 1937.

Mr. EVINS. And you support the statement of the engineer, Mr. Alexander?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I certainly do.

Mr. EVINS. I thank you for your statement and pictures. You make a persuasive statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like you folks to come out and really visit us.

SAN LORENZO CREEK, ALAMEDA COUNTY

Mr. HILL. Our next witness is Mr. Pursel, chairman of the board of supervisors for the county of Alameda.

Mr. PURSEL. My name is Kent D. Pursel, and I am chairman of the board of supervisors of the county of Alameda. I have a prepared statement that I would like to insert in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. KENT D. PURSEL, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, CALIF.

The board of supervisors of the county is the governing body of the Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The district is divided into zones for the purpose of financing improvements. The San Lorenzo Creek drainage basin lies in zone No. 2 of the district. It includes the densely populated communities of Ashland, Cherryland, Castro Valley, San Lorenzo, Washington Manor, and large parts of the cities of Hayward and San Leandro. The total population in the zone today is estimated at 100,000 and it is still increasing at a rapid rate.

Before 1943, the San Lorenzo Creek area was almost entirely a farming community, with a few small villages here and there, and a very small city of Hayward. Since the building of San Lorenzo Village beginning in 1943, the growth in the entire drainage basin has been phenomenal. The rate of population increase has been one of the fastest in the Nation. The residents are mostly veterans and industrial workers and their families.

The rapid popuation growth has resulted in a severe strain on the local economy to provide schools, fire protection, police protection, sewerage, streets, and all the other facilities that are needed for an urban area. Property tax rates in some parts of this locality exceed $10 per $100 of assessed valuation. In spite of this, the local people in zone 2 approved a bond issue of $6,954,000 for local flood-control and storm-drainage improvements to supplement the Federal project in San Lorenzo Creek. Some of these funds have been expended on emergency improvement of the lower reaches of the creek below Hesperian Boulevard. This emergency work, being mostly earthwork, is subject to severe damage and deterioration until such time that the permanent concrete work of the Federal project has been constructed. Also, there is no protection from the major

floods which have occurred in the past and which could break out of the channel above East 14th Street. That would be a serious disaster, and that is the thing on which we need your help.

I understand that the Corps of Engineers have found this project to have a very favorable economic justification. The local people are ready with their cooperation and are already acquiring rights-of-way and modifying utilities and highway bridges, required by the Federal project, at very considerable expense. There is an opportunity here to prevent a serious disaster if we all act promptly. We respectfully request the initial appropriation required for this project.

Mr. PURSEL. I might say that I talked to Congressman Miller and he made mention of the fact that he was going to appear before the committee on the 11th with reference to the same matter.

The Alameda County Board of Supervisors are also the governing body in the Flood Control and Water Conservation District of Alameda County.

I might say at the outset that to my knowledge I know of no opposition to the San Lorenzo Creek project. For the purpose of financing the flood-control project and drainage project in the flood-control area of Alameda County, the board has divided it up into zones. San Lorenzo Creek is in zone No. 1. Zone No. 2 of the flood-control district is comprised of about 100,000 people, and included within that area are the communities of Ashland, Cherryland, Castro Valley, Washington Manor, and San Lorenzo. The total population in the zone today is estimated at 100,000, and it is still increasing at a rapid rate.

Before 1934 the San Lorenzo Creek area was almost entirely a farming community, with a few small villages here and there, and the very small city of Hayward. Since the building of San Lorenzo Village, beginning in 1943, the growth in the entire drainage basin has been phenomenal. The rate of population increase has been one of the fastest in the Nation. The residents are mostly veterans and industrial workers and their families.

You are familiar with Oakland, Berkeley, and Alameda. They have grown up. The growth and development that have taken place in the southern end of the county, to wit, zone No. 2, has been great.

In 1943 San Lorenzo was nothing. Now it is a thriving community. This has created a lot of problems. There have been the problems of providing schools and police protection, fire protection, and sewerage. There is a tax in excess of $10 per $100 valuation. In one case it is $10.75 per $100.

Mr. HAND. What is the percentage basis of your assessment?

Mr. PURSEL. Twenty-nine percent, I believe of the 1939 replacement cost. These are all, I might say, new moderately priced homes in the main. Despite this fact and this terrific tax rate that I just mentioned, by a decisive majority they have just voted a bond issue of some $6,954,000. They have spent already some $475,000 to widen and deepen this channel from Hesperian Boulevard to the bay. A lot could be classified as emergency work. Naturally, we are concerned because we did have a flood out there of severe proportions in the 1951–52 winter.

In the main, the estimated damage was $2 million in all southern Alameda County. It was not that great in this particular area, but there was a lot of damage.

With a view to precluding such a disaster hitting us again, they have, as I have said, done some work to take care of the immediate

necessity upon us. Naturally, it is temporary and requires concrete to finish the job.

I understand the Army Corps of Engineers have appraised this matter and have stated that it has a very favorable economic justification, as they term it. I urge you gentlemen, if you will, to please give this your consideration. I think the request is for some $175,000 to be used for design, studies, and surveys by the Army Corps of Engineers.

I thank you very much for the opportunity of appearing before you.

There is another member of our board, Mr. Stanley. I would like for you to hear a word from him.

Mr. STANLEY. My name is Chester E. Stanley. This project, while considerable emergency work has been done by bonding by the local zone in the flood-control district, it is of the nature that should we have a flood of the enormity of the 1951–52 winter that Chairman Pursel mentioned, we would have considerable damage to that work due to the fact that the outfalls are not lined.

Above the city of Hayward, and through some of the portions of the city, this creek is overgrown with trees and brush and the channel is inadequate and the flow of water is impaired so it causes considerable damage in its upper reaches to the city of Hayward as well as the community of Castro Valley, which is also a highly developed residential area.

I do not believe this item requested is in the proposed budget for this year, but we are hopeful that we can get the earliest consideration of it. In comparison to figures quoted, this item is not large. It runs not in excess of $200,000.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to make these statements before you. If there are any questions, I will try to answer them for you.

Mr. EVINS. The funds that you are requesting have been budgeted?

Mr. STANLEY. To my knowledge, no.

Mr. EVINS. Are you asking for funds?

Mr. STANLEY. We are asking plans money not to exceed $200,000.

Mr. EVINS. It has been authorized but not approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. STANLEY. I believe that that is the situation.

Mr. HILL. Our next witness is Mr. Koch of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce on the same project.

Mr. KOCH. My name is Guilford Koch. I am a member of the Alameda County New Industries Committee, which is a division of the Oakland Chamber of Commerce. My committee is charged with the responsibility of conducting a national advertising and promotional program to bring industry to Alameda County.

This program is financed by the board of supervisors, by the Oakland City Council, and by the Oakland Chamber of Commerce. Our yearly budget exceeds $100,000.

The program has also been carried on for quite a number of years, and I merely want to make a verbal statement to point out to you it has been somewhat successful. We have, as you know, quite an influx of population in California and in our particular county, and the only way we know how to take care of the people that come in

there is to provide jobs for them. We either provide jobs or put them on the welfare rolls.

To give you some idea of this program, we advertised in such national publications as Fortune, Business Week, United States News, and World Report, Time, and that type of publication. We also conduct a direct mail campaign. We are also on television. In the past 10 years, from 1945 to 1954, we have had in Alameda County 1,556 industrial projects. When I say "industrial projects" I am speaking of manufacturing firms. The 1,556 includes new firms as well as expansion of existing firms.

The capital investment in plants, buildings and land and equipment is in excess of $288 million. These new plants and expansions have created 34,175 new jobs.

Now, as this development takes place, it not only creates a problem as far as drainage is concerned in the industrial area, but also the residential subdivisions that are created to house the workers in these various plants. As the area develops industrially and residentially there are more streets developed and your runoff of water increases constantly every year. It has gotten to a point in this particular part of the country that it has been affected by San Lorenzo Creek to where we are faced, when we have heavy rains, with floods in the residential as well as the industrial area.

The fact is that the condition has somewhat retarded us in our industrial growth in the last 2 or 3 years because I can well remember in 1950–51, when we had heavy rains, a particular firm in San Leandro had water right up to the point where if it rose a couple of inches more it would have ruined several hundred thousand dollars of inventory that they had in their warehouse.

I would like to show you gentlemen some aerial photographs taken a few months ago to give you some idea of the growth in that area. I want to say practically all this growth has taken place since 1947. I would like to say that the area involved in San Leandro and Hayward was practically all farms with few industrial plants, You can take a look and see what the situation is today.

Chrysler and Dodge are in here, and Zellerbach and dozens of other companies. This area is the most rapidly developing part of the county.

The next photograph will show you more of San Leandro the General Foods plant and the residential area around it.

This is Hayward and the airport and this is the residential area [indicating].

I would like to leave copies of the industrial growth summary with you to be filed with the statement.

Mr. EVINS. We will insert it in the record at this point.

(The summary referred to follows:)

Statistical summary of industrial growth in Alameda County, 1945–54

MAJOR NEW INDUSTRIES

Year	Number	Investment	Jobs	Payroll
1945	36	$4,250,000	1,500	$3,000,000
1946	75	12,500,000	1,300	3,250,000
1947	59	14,472,500	5,039	15,117,000
1948	56	7,836,500	934	2,802,000
1949	65	5,219,000	1,008	3,024,000
1950	45	15,925,500	1,380	4,140,000
1951	58	17,286,000	2,000	6,000,000
1952	48	6,475,000	1,086	3,482,400
1953	43	3,660,500	414	1,490,400
1954	49	5,503,000	558	2,008,800
Total (10 years)	534	94,128,000	15,219	44,314,600

MAJOR EXPANSIONS OF EXISTING PLANTS

1945	24	$9,500,000	1,000	$2,000,000
1946	80	28,000,000	3,500	8,750,000
1947	125	24,861,257	2,519	7,557,000
1948	106	16,011,600	1,280	3,840,000
1949	93	15,545,300	717	2,151,000
1950	122	12,875,850	1,192	3,576,000
1951	142	23,777,800	4,766	14,298,000
1952	118	36,446,596	1,829	5,716,800
1953	114	15,780,000	1,343	4,834,800
1954	98	11,889,500	810	2,916,000
Total (10 years)	1,022	194,687,903	18,956	55,639,600

TOTAL INDUSTRIAL GROWTH—NEW INDUSTRIES AND EXPANSIONS

1945	60	$13,750,000	2,500	$5,000,000
1946	155	40,500,000	4,800	12,000,000
1947	184	40,333,757	7,558	22,674,000
1948	162	23,848,100	2,214	6,642,000
1949	158	20,764,300	1,725	5,175,000
1950	167	28,801,350	2,572	7,716,000
1951	200	41,063,800	6,766	20,298,000
1952	166	42,921,596	2,915	9,199,200
1953	157	19,440,500	1,757	6,325,200
1954	147	17,392,500	1,368	4,924,800
Total (10 years)	1,556	288,815,903	34,175	99,954,200

Average number of projects per month for 10-year period	13
Average investment per project for 10-year period	$185,614
Average investment per month for 10-year period	$2,406,800
Average number of jobs created per project for 10-year period	22
Average number of jobs created per month for 10-year period	285
Average payroll increase per month for 10-year period	$832,952

Mr. HAND. This question that I am going to ask you is not intended to be in any way critical of your ambitious program, or to indicate the slightest opposition to it, but in effect is not this what you are doing; you are spending $100,000 a year, and you are attracting more and more industries. Some of those industries come from Mr. Murray's area in Illinois; some may come from mine and from Mr. Evins' district, and as you get them there you create a lot of problems for yourselves and you come to the Federal Government for additional aid; is that about it?

Mr. KOCH. No; I would not say so. The growth in the Western States in the last few years, as you know, has created a very attractive market to all manufacturers. Now, please do not misunderstand me. We do not attempt to move industry as industry from one area to an-

other, such as has happened in the New England States in the movement to the South. We merely present the facts about our area to any manufacturer and due to the expanding west coast market he wants to establish a branch plant. Practically all these new industries that we get out there are branches of eastern concerns. Entering into that picture, of course, is your transportation problem, your freight rates going up, and all of that.

If a manufacturer of radio moves out there, it gives him a competitive advantage over the fellow still back in Philadelphia or New England, or back here where they have that freight charge to pay.

It also enabled them to serve their customers better because the customers would not have to carry the large inventories, as he does if they are miles and miles away.

Mr. HAND. I would not want to be critical of California coming into the Federal Government for aid in the first place, because I have been greatly impressed, especially with the city of Los Angeles, with the degree of local participation. In the second place, I would like to say that California pays its very fair share of the expense of the Federal Government.

At the same time, it does seem to me that you are entering upon a very ambitious program to attract new population and new industries, and thereby creating a problem which requires you to come to us to help support those problems self-created.

Mr. KOCH. People come to California, Mr. Hand, regardless of whether we invite them or not.

Mr. MURRAY. I was just wondering if the county has a planning commission to determine what action is suitable for preventing these floods. Have they some commission that is interested in determining that?

Mr. KOCH. The county has a planning commission, and they also have a local control board and department. And in that connection, the local people—and this is in the statement that Congressman Miller will file with you, if he has not already done so, the local people have demonstrated their willingness to pay their share of the program, by organizing themselves into a flood-control district, zone 2. And in 1953 they voted by well over a two-thirds majority a $6,954,000 bond issue to construct storm drainage and flood-control improvements in this creek drainage basin, to supplement those proposed in the Federal project.

During the past 2 years, local interests have spent $480,000 in local funds for acquisition of land, easements, and rights-of-way and modification to bridges and utilities needed for the Federal project, and for the construction of emergency improvements to this creek, and the local improvements are subject to severe damage and deterioration until the Federal project is constructed.

And this particular request is for only $175,000.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. KOCH. Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Shelley, would you like to make a statement to the committee?

Mr. SHELLEY. I might make this observation only, in reference to what Mr. Hand has said, God gave us a climate that attracts people out there, and the Federal Government had a problem around 1939, or

1940, which led them to bring a lot of people into California, to set up plants, airplane and shipbuilding, and some of these people had to go out and get the people and they liked it so well that they stayed there. So it was a contribution to the security of the Nation that we had to make and we now ask the Nation to help us.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like the record to show that Congressman Heistand of southern California was here, but I believe he had to leave.

I believe that our time is about up, or practically so, and I would like to explain one thing that has come up here, and that is the difference between the figures we presented to the Board and what the Army engineers have presented. The water resources board figures were worked up last summer on the best information available at that time with regard to the amount of work or the status of the work of the program.

Of course, the figures have been revised and it is my understanding that even the Folsom project may be reduced by $1.5 million.

In general, our request is intended to be in line with the figures represented by the Army engineers, except for these first items for which we ask for planning funds.

Now, our time is about up and we certainly appreciate the interest of the committee, and thank you very much for this opportunity to make our presentation.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Hill, for arranging for the schedule of witnesses, for all of the congressional delegation of the State of California, and on behalf of all the members of the committee, I want you to know that we appreciate your presentation.

Mr. KOCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955.

SACRAMENTO CANAL HARBOR PROJECT

WITNESS

WARREN H. ATHERTON

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to hear at this time Mr. Warren Atherton, former national commander of the American Legion, who has expressed a request to make an additional statement.

Mr. ATHERTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Since I appeared before the committee, I have the port of Oakland, which I referred to in my testimony.

Oakland is a community of 400,000 people on the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay and the city of Oakland has made a large investment in world operation ports, and that port is only operating at about 50 percent of its capacity.

A great deal of the tonnage referred to in my testimony yesterday now moves through the port of Oakland and the port of Oakland exists through the budget of the State, city, and Federal funds, and would be seriously hurt.

The manager of the port of Oakland, in behalf of the port of Oakland, has asked me to file his statement on behalf of that city and of

this port, giving the reason why they do not believe the appropriation outside of the budget should be made at this time, and urging that a resurvey of the benefit ratio be made by the Army engineers with public hearings.

Mr. EVINS. It may be received.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT BY THE PORT OF OAKLAND, CALIF., AGAINST APPROPRIATION FOR SACRAMENTO CANAL HARBOR PROJECT

Oakland is a community of 400,000 people on the east shore of San Francisco Bay. The city of Oakland owns and operates a harbor with wharves, warehouses, and shipping facilities. This is one of six ports now serving the merchant marine on San Francisco Bay and tributaries.

Oakland is opposed to appropriating money at this time to start the Sacramento project without first having the Army engineers reappraise the project in order that a proper and current beneficial ratio can be established.

A new deep water port at Sacramento would create no new ocean tonnage and would only lessen the business of existing ports without corresponding benefit to the public.

The marine tonnage originating in the interior valleys of California is now adequately served by ports on the bay. Three transcontinental railroads and many major highways now connect these valleys directly with Oakland and neighboring ports.

A ship would have to make a 180-mile 2-day trip to serve the proposed port. The cost of operation of modern ships is $3,000 per day. The average ship pickup at Stockton in the same inland area as it is proposed to create a new port is 2,500 tons. The added cost of movement by ship of $2.40 per ton is more than the cost of movement by existing means of transportation.

The port of Oakland and all other ports in the area have received the benefit of many millions of Federal funds in the deepening and maintenance of channels.

Oakland and the other ports have invested many millions of dollars in their wharves, warehouses, and shipping facilities. The total investment runs into hundreds of millions. Why invest more Federal funds now to further jeopardize the present investment until an up-to-date reappraisal has been made. The trade is adequately served by facilities only operating at 50 percent of capacity.

Tonnage through the Golden Gate, to and from northern California, excepting military cargo and oil, has been dropping since 1940.

Military cargo is mostly served by military terminals; most of the oil is served by privately owned specialty facilities.

The above facts are irrefutably established by a California State Senate committee report completed in 1951 and brought down to date by engineering and trade studies.

After consideration of this most thorough report of 598 pages with numerous tables, analyses and summaries embracing figures for a period of 10 to 25 years, the conclusion is inevitable that creation of the port of Sacramento will not create new tonnage. It will split the tonnage now being adequately handled by existing ports and will increase their handicaps and deficits.

The Sacramento port project calls for digging a 30-mile deep water channel through dry land and constructing from scratch a new inland port, all tributary to existing facilities on San Francisco Bay, at a present day cost as estimated by United States Army engineers, of $34 million.

Ship operators have testified that in their opinion there will be no saving to the public because the saving that would be realized by shippers is offset by increased costs to the vessel operator in traversing 180 miles of inland waterways to serve an additional port that would divert business from existing port facilities. The loss of tonnage by the ports serving this area now would increase their cost of operation and consequently the cost to the public.

The San Francisco Bay Harbor area, reached through the Golden Gate, is now adequately served by the port facilities of San Francisco, Oakland, Alameda, Richmond, Stockton, and Redwood City. These harbors already have 50 percent more capacity than necessary to serve the demand for the foreseeable future.

If the port of Sacramento, 90 miles inland, is constructed, it can only gain tonnage at the expense of existing ports with increase of their deficits and probable deficit operation of the new port.

The fact that there is no urgency for an appropriation to begin the Sacramento project is shown by its estimated cost-benefit ratio. The Army engineers estimate a benefit ratio of 1.12 to 1.0. This is barely above minimum requirement and places the project very low on the list of approved projects.

Engineers, shipping experts, and traffic men estimate the ratio at less than 1 to 1.

It is the considered conclusion of the board of port commissioners of the city of Oakland before consideration is given to an appropriation of money for the construction of another port serving the San Francisco Bay area that a reappraisal and public hearing be had by the Army engineers, in order to determine accurately the benefit ratio that might ensue. We do not believe that there exists sufficient tonnage to make a new port pay. Building such a port would increase costs to most shippers using it, would seriously increase the operational costs of shipowners and would increase the financing difficulties of the existing ports in which the Federal, State, and local governments already have hundreds of millions of dollars invested.

Respectfully submitted.

DUDLEY W. FROST, *Manager, Port of Oakland.*

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much for your statement.

Mr. MURRAY. The principal objection to the Federal Government's participation, as I understand it, is that there should not be a port there because it is going to injure the business of other ports.

But it seems to me that the problem as to how many ports should exist in California is a problem of the State legislature. Has the State legislature indicated that it did not want a port in that area, or indicated its disapproval?

Mr. ATHERTON. No. There is no regular machinery by which the legislature or the State government can regulate the number of ports in California today.

Mr. MURRAY. The State of California authorizes the creation of the port district, does it not?

Mr. ATHERTON. By general law, it permits any district to form a port district, if it so desires, and in this particular area a district was formed, and a bond issue was floated, and before the first shovelful of earth moved—and that is unfortunate, that the district has spent some money on railroads and other things that are self-sufficient anyway, but on the public-utility principle, there are already six ports in this area, with a capacity to serve and since the Federal Government has an investment, the investment of the public will be lost by the creation of this port.

Mr. MURRAY. The public utility is controlled by the State?

Mr. ATHERTON. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. And in this case, and that is my very point, that, as I understand it from the testimony that you have given, and some of the others have given, the State legislature amended its authorizing law for these port districts to permit the creation of this particular port district.

Mr. ATHERTON. At the request of the district; yes. They amended the general law which permits any group of people in California, within the municipal boundaries, whether it is in a city or a county, to band together and incorporate themselves as a municipal district; that is, under the general law.

Mr. MURRAY. Does that not require the finding of necessity, or a finding of public convenience, prior to the creation of such districts?

Mr. ATHERTON. It does not, Congressman Murray; no such requirement at all, and, thereafter, they are not under any utility regulation of any kind whatsoever.

Mr. MURRAY. That is an unusual State procedure.

Mr. ATHERTON. Yes; that is the procedure.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that this is a problem for the State and if the public cannot stand another port, it would be a State problem.

Mr. ATHERTON. It would seem to be possibly a subject for future State legislation, probably subject to future State legislation, but that legislation does not exist now. It authorized the creation by popular vote in any district.

May I just add one additional thought, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. EVINS. Certainly.

Mr. ATHERTON. And you have been very patient with me.

I know there has been some comment about the imports of these ports to the great State of California, but I would like to call your attention to the fact that population does not necessarily affect tonnage. Let me give you one instance: Campbell Soups used to ship 200,000 tons a year through the canal and into San Francisco Bay for distribution in northern California; they decided to build a great plant in the Sacramento area and when they built their plant in Sacramento they used California tomatoes for California to eat, so the 200,000 tonnage ceased to exist from around New Jersey, and there is no longer that tonnage at all. They are using tomatoes produced in the California area for Californians to eat, with the increase in population, because the people in California consume what is produced there.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Atherton, for your statement.

Mr. ATHERTON. Thank you.

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1955.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA SURVEY

WITNESS

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. We are delighted to have the privilege of hearing at this time our colleague from California, Hon. Charles S. Gubser.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, in wise recognition of the many problems confronting the entire area contiguous to San Francisco Bay, the Congress last year authorized the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army to make a survey of the bay and its tributaries. This undertaking, planned over a period of 5 years, will encompass many fields of research, including salinity studies, effect of salt-water barriers, ground-water tables in adjacent lands, sand drifts, and many others.

These studies are to be carried out in close cooperation with the State of California.

With an initial appropriation granted last year, the engineers laid plans for the study and set up the organization for it. The program calls for construction of a working model of the bay during the first

year, with evaluation studies to be made during the subsequent 4 years. I am informed that construction of the model will cost about $500,000 and can be completed during the 1956 fiscal year.

The budget proposal before you provides only $250,000 for the bay area study, only half the amount required for completion of the model. I respectfully suggest to you that deferring the completion for another year will merely prolong the timetable but will in noway save the Government any money. The entire study depends on the model. The later this model becomes operative, the longer it will take to arrive at the conclusions for which all of northern California is waiting.

I am here, Mr. Chairman, asking that instead of an appropriation of $250,000 the amount be increased to $500,000 and again I want to impress upon the committee that this in no way affects the overall eventual cost of the project which has been authorized; as I say, it merely affects the timetable, because Army engineers contemplate that no other data can be available from this survey until this scale model, the hydraulic operating model, is completed, and that it will take $500,000 to complete this model.

The schedule under which they are operating calls for a 5-year completion survey, and it will be 6 years unless this model is completed in the first year.

So I would like to emphasize very strongly, if I may, that this does not involve any extra expenditure of money; it merely is to maintain the originally contemplated timetable and in the long run, it will cost exactly the same.

I have been joined in this request by 9 members of the California delegation in the House and I would like to insert at this point in the record a letter addressed by 9 of us to the Honorable Clarence Cannon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. It is signed by Hubert B. Scudder of the 1st District; Clair Engle of the 2d District; John E. Moss, Jr., of the 3d District; William S. Mailliard of the 4th District; John F. Baldwin of the 6th; J. Arthur Younger of the 9th; and myself of the 10th District, Leroy Johnson of the 11th, and John J. Allen, Jr., of the 7th District.

I would like to add that Congressman Shelley who represents one of the San Francisco districts, was not approached to sign this letter for the reason that he is a member of the Appropriations Committee and we did not think it was fair to approach him on this matter; so he was not asked for that reason to sign the letter.

(The letter referred to follows:)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATVES,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1955.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: For many years Representatives in Congress from northern and central California districts have been aware of the growing need for a comprehensive study of San Francisco Bay and its tributaries. The project has aroused widespread interest among our constituents, and we, the undersigned, were happy to see the 5-year program finally established and authorized by the 83d Congress. The sum of $50,000 was budgeted to initiate preliminary work.

In view of the constantly changing picture in the San Francisco Bay area we realize that in order to obtain the maximum value from the results of the survey and the investment it represents, the work must be completed on schedule.

First step in the survey is the completion of a working model of the bay. In answer to specific questions, Col. John A. Graf, San Francisco district engineer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, wrote under date of January 17, 1955:

"I wish to confirm your understanding that the current priority item for orderly progress on this study is the completion of a scale model of the bay. Since the conclusions of this investigation will be based largely on the model study findings, any delay in its construction will defer completion of the report."

Colonel Graf and officers of the Headquarters, Corps of Engineers, further confirmed that scheduled progress requires the construction and verification of the model in the first year, and that most of the prototype data will be required for the model verification. Cost of this phase has been estimated at $500,000, and officials of the United States Corps of Engineers affirmed that $500,000 could be used within the 1956 fiscal year.

At the same time it should be pointed out that the work in question is not only of local importance to the areas contiguous to San Francisco Bay, but has been recognized as affecting the whole State of California. Consequently the Legislature of the State of California has set aside the sum of $500,000 for its share in the study of San Francisco Bay. Half of this, $250,000, already has been appropriated, and the other half is at the disposal of the State division of water resources when asked for.

Close cooperation is being maintained between the Corps of Engineers and the State of California in carrying out the work. Recently two reports prepared by the Corps of Engineers were submitted to the State for review, and upon completion of a current report by the State, the Corps will be given an opportunity to review it in order to preclude duplication of effort. Cooperative activity also has been accomplished in connection with flow measurements, evaporation, and transpiration measurements. Meetings of the board of consultants reviewing the State's report are attended by representatives of the Corps of Engineers.

A vast area of California is affected by this tremendously important work. We strongly believe that it should be allowed to progress on schedule, and that, in particular, the crucial first-year program should be carried out. The Federal Government is committed to the survey. A delay could not be construed as economy since the value obtained from the survey would depreciate as time goes on. Changing conditions make it more efficient and economical to adhere to the engineering schedule and construct the model during the 1956 fiscal year.

We, therefore, respectfully request that the $250,000 provision in the budget for this purpose be increased to $500,000.

Yours sincerely,

Hubert B. Scudder, 1st District; Clair Engle, 2d District; John E. Moss, Jr., 3d District; William S. Mailliard, 4th District; John F. Baldwin, Jr., 6th District; J. Arthur Younger, 9th District; Charles S. Gubser, 10th District; Leroy Johnson, 11th District; John J. Allen, Jr., 7th District.

Mr. GUBSER. The engineers have indicated in their letter to me that this money can be used and it does conform to their original schedule, and I would like to quote just one paragraph of the letter that I received from Colonel Graf, district engineer, of the Corps of Engineers, in his letter dated January 17, 1955:

I wish to confirm your understanding that the current priority item for orderly progress on this study is the completion of a scale model of the bay. Since the conclusions of this investigation will be based largely on the model study findings, any delay in its construction will defer completion of the report.

And they confirm that it will take $500,000 to complete the scale model on schedule.

Now, may I also have permission to insert in the record a letter from the Santa Clara County Farm Bureau advocating that this appropriation be increased from $250,000 to $500,000? It is signed by E. A. Teresi, president, and R. Ken Wilhelm, county secretary.

Mr. EVINS. It may be received.

(The letter referred to follows:)

SANTA CLARA COUNTY FARM BUREAU

Re Increase in civil works appropriation bill funds for construction of San Francisco Bay area model.

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 3,
House Appropriations Subcommittee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We urge you to give favorable consideration to increasing from $250,000 to $500,000 the sum set forth in the 1956 fiscal year appropriations for the construction of the San Francisco Bay area hydraulic model at Sausalito, Calif., by the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

This revision of funds is merely a rescheduling of planned expenditures for this model and will make possible its completion within a year rather than the 2 years originally contemplated by the Corps of Engineers.

As the proper solution of a great number of problems relating to navigation, shoaling, salinity control, salt-clearing locks, salt-water barriers, land reclamation, water transportation, and distribution cannot be made until an operating hydraulic model is constructed, the people of the West are most concerned with expediting the construction of the model.

As you know, our organization has a conservative approach to the expenditure of funds, and we have most carefully examined and reexamined this request before making it.

Therefore, we most sincerely ask your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

SANTA CLARA COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
R. KEN WILHELM, *County Secretary.*
E. A. TERESI, *President.*

Mr. GUBSER. I would also like to have permission, if I may, to insert in the record at this point a letter from the Building and Construction Trades Council of Santa Clara and San Benito Counties, advocating the same thing, and signed by Mr. O. E. Sargent, executive secretary, and Henry T. Gunderson, president, representing a committee of Mr. V. S. Swain, carpenters; A. R. Tully, bricklayers; R. Brennan, council; and H. Gilmore, laborers.

Mr. EVINS. It may be made a part of the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL
OF SANTA CLARA AND SAN BENITO COUNTIES,
May 2, 1955.

Subject: (S. Res. No. 119) Civil works appropriation bill, budget allocation $250,000 for model study, San Francisco Bay.

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 3 OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE.

GENTLEMEN: With particular reference to funds provided in the fiscal budget for construction of a scale model of San Francisco Bay and environs, we wish to state that the Building and Construction Trades Council and its 34 affiliated local unions are on record in support of an immediate appropriate of $500,000, thereby enabling the United States Army Corps of Engineers to complete their studies with despatch.

Our request for the above amount is not to be construed as additional funds; instead, it is intended to accelerate the timetable of operations. In conclusion, may we point out the existing water emergency and transportation as well as our military defense.

Our council's committee has served diligently for 5 years with regard to this all-important study.

Very truly yours,

O. E. SARGENT, *Executive Secretary.*
HENRY T. GUNDERSON, *President.*

Mr. GUBSER. I would also like permission to submit for the record at this point a letter from the Bay Counties Water Problems Committee of Oakland, Calif., which is the committee organized from the official representatives from the boards of supervisors of the following counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Benito, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma, and Yolo, and these groups also advocate the $500,000.

Mr. EVINS. The letter may be received for the record.

(The letter referred to follows:)

BAY COUNTIES WATER PROBLEMS COMMITTEE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Oakland 7, Calif., February 3, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Bay Counties Water Problems Committee, which was organized in January 1954, is comprised of official representatives designated by the boards of supervisors of the following counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Benito, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma, and Yolo.

At the last regular meeting held at Santa Cruz on January 28, 1955, and attended by the official representatives of nine member counties, the committee voted unanimously to request your assistance in securing the appropriation of not less than $500,000 to the Corps of Engineers in the next fiscal year for the comprehensive survey of San Francisco Bay and tributaries, Calif.

The amount of $500,000 is necessary to permit completion of construction of the hydraulic model of San Fransico Bay, which is urgently needed to secure answers to many engineering questions relating to the bay. Until the model is completed and placed in operation, untold losses will result from further delay in important research work in flood control, navigation, water supply, and related fields.

In view of the importance of the San Francisco Bay area in the national economy, any unnecessary delay in completing this important research facility would appear to be false economy.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT G. CROWLE, *Secretary.*

Mr. GUBSER. I do not know whether to request permission to include this letter or not, Mr. Chairman; it is a letter to me from the Corps of Engineers indicating that the money is necessary for the completion of this model this year.

Mr. EVINS. It may be included.

(The letter referred to follows:)

CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER,
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT,
San Francisco, Calif., January 17, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: I have your letter of January 11, 1955 in regard to certain information you desire concerned the comprehensive survey of San Francisco Bay. I wish to confirm your understanding that the current priority item for orderly progress on this study is the completion of a scale model of the bay. Since the conclusions of this investigation will be based largely on the model study findings, any delay in its construction will defer completion of the report.

The cost of the survey report was estimated in our preliminary examination at $2,500,000, including $585,000 for a comprehensive model study of the bay. The model study estimate includes cost of prototype observations required for model operation as well as cost of the testing program and a report of the model findings. The report is presently programed for completion in 5 years. Scheduled

progress requires the construction and verification of the model in the first year. Most of the prototype data will be required for the model verification. It is estimated that $500,000 is needed in the first year to accomplish the work described above.

A close coordination has been maintained with the State of California in connection with their barrier studies currently under way. In compliance with a contract between the State and this office, two reports prepared by this office were submitted to the State in October. These reports consisted of: (1) A review of sedimentation data and investigations in San Francisco Bay system and adjoining Central Valley; and (2) Designs and quantity estimates for salt clearing locks in barriers under consideration by the State. A careful review of basic data accumulated by this office has been made by the State and such information that could be used in their report has been made available. Upon completion of the barrier report by the State, a corresponding review will be made by this office of recent basic data acquired by the State in order to preclude any duplication of effort. Cooperative activity has been accomplished in connection with flow measurements into Suisun Bay, traffic studies over barriers, and evaporation and transpiration measurements throughout the bay and delta areas. The corps has been invited to attend the meetings of the board of consultants reviewing the State's report. In these meetings problems relative to design and justification of barriers have been accentuated and possible solutions thereto discussed.

I am pleased to inform you that in all of the activity coordinated with the State the relationship has been one of mutual assistance with a view to reduce the cost of investigations and avoid duplication of effort. I can assure you that the corps will pursue this policy not only with the State but with all local interests that might contribute to the comprehensive study.

Very truly yours,

J. A. GRAF,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer.

Mr. GUBSER. I think, Mr. Chairman, that about concludes my testimony.

I would like again to emphasize the fact that the entire area of northern California will be affected by the data that will be gathered from this survey. This area is growing by leaps and bounds and I think you are also aware of that fact, and it is obvious that the sooner we can have this data, the more valuable it will be. If the present appropriation of $250,000 is allowed to stand, the time schedule for the completion of this survey will be delayed by 1 year. The value of the survey will be decreased by that amount.

We are not asking for any new funds, insofar as the eventual cost is concerned, but we are merely asking that the original contemplated schedule be maintained.

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Gubser, I think you have made a fine statement; you are rather persuasive and I believe you have answered most of my questions.

Mr. GUBSER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1955.

RICHMOND HARBOR, CALIF.

WITNESSES

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS CARLSON, CITY ATTORNEY OF RICHMOND, CALIF.
ROBERT F. DONOGHUE, REPRESENTING THE PACIFIC AMERICAN TANKSHIP ASSOCIATION
RALPH E. DEWEY, REPRESENTING THE PACIFIC AMERICAN STEAMSHIP ASSOCIATION

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to hear next our colleague, Congressman Baldwin, and the witnesses he will present, and also our colleague, Mr. Miller, of California, on the Richmond Harbor project.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, we are coming to you on the Richmond Harbor project because we feel there is a tremendous urgency about it. This whole matter started back some years ago, as Congressman Miller will tell you, because it was in his district at the time it was started and he did much of the work on the project.

This project was authorized last year by the 83d Congress. There were no funds provided for it in the budget that came before the Congress this year.

I have written a letter to the Corps of Engineers asking them how much money they could profitably use this coming fiscal year if the money was appropriated, and the answer I received, which I would like to place in the record, is signed by Brig. Gen. E. C. Itschner and states funds in the amount of $1 million could be profitably expended in fiscal year 1956, of which $323,000 would be applied to dredging the channel in Southampton Shoal and the approach area to the Richmond Long Wharf, and the balance used to initiate work under a continuing contract for dredging the inner harbor and entrance channel. Then the remainder would have to be appropriated in the following fiscal year.

The reason we are here on an urgency basis, Mr. Chairman, is that the tankers have been increased in size, they have been increased in draft, and now it has reached the point where the tankers coming into Richmond Harbor can only come into the harbor at high tide and very serious damage could result by reason of the inadequate draft.

Mr. EVINS. The project has been authorized by Congress and Brigadier General Itschner, of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, recommends that $1 million could be profitably used in fiscal year 1956?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. What does the Bureau of the Budget say?

Mr. BALDWIN. The President's budget did not include any amount for this project. We are here because we feel there is a tremendous urgency about it and that in the coming fiscal year there could be an accident because of inadequate draft that might cause a tanker

to be swept against the pier or something of that kind, and we might have damage far larger than the $1 million.

Mr. EVINS. Have funds for this project been recommended more than once by the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. BALDWIN. They were recommended first last year, but the hearings began in 1948.

I would like now, if I may, to suggest that the letter of the Corps of Engineers be placed in evidence.

Mr. EVINS. The letter may be received in evidence.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C. March 11, 1955.

Hon. JOHN F. BALDWIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BALDWIN: Reference is made to your letter of February 21, 1955, requesting the estimated amount of funds which could profitably be expended in the fiscal year 1956 for the Richmond Harbor, Calif., project. Your letter was acknowledged on February 24, 1955.

Funds in the amount of $1 million could be profitably expended in fiscal year 1956 of which $323,000 would be applied to dredging the channel in Southampton Shoal and the approach area to the Richmond Long Wharf, and the balance used to initiate work under a continuing contract for dredging the inner harbor and entrance channel. The present Federal cost of the improvement authorized by Public Law 780, 83d Congress is estimated at $2,160,000. Accordingly, an additional appropriation of $1,160,000 would be required after fiscal year 1956 to complete the project.

I hope the above will serve your purpose. However, should you desire further information, I shall be pleased to furnish it upon your request.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Mr. BALDWIN. And now we will have Congressman Miller make a statement, and then Mr. Thomas Carlson, city attorney of Richmond; and Mr. Robert F. Donaghue, representing the Pacific American Tankship Association; and Mr. Ralph E. Dewey, representing the Pacific American Steamship Association, have short statements.

Mr. EVINS. They may proceed.

Mr. BALDWIN. The next witness will be Congressman Miller.

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to hear from our colleague.

Mr. MILLER. As my colleague has told you, I formerly represented this district and I believe on one occasion came before this committee urging money for this project.

Mr. EVINS. I might say to my friend that you have been coming before the committee several times lately.

Mr. MILLER. Maybe too often.

Mr. EVINS. We are always glad to see you and to hear you.

Mr. MILLER. Richmond Harbor is an adjunct of San Francisco Bay. The Standard Oil Co. adjacent to it serves the naval petroleum depot. During the war this was a very important installation and in the event of another emergency this would be the principal source of getting oil out of San Francisco Bay. That is one of the reasons this is important.

As Mr. Baldwin has told you, we have gone into bigger tankers and although I have not represented that portion of the district that he new represents for 4 years, even 4 years ago tankers that were not as

big as those now in operation or projected would have to sit in the mud at low tide, they could not get in and out freely.

The Standard Oil Co. is going to bring in crude oil in this port from Malaya, and to me that is important because it conserves our local supply of oil. This is one of the places it will be landed for refinement, and as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am perhaps a little more conscious now of the value of this installation with respect to the national defense picture.

Mr. EVINS. You are supporting fully the $1 million request?

Mr. MILLER. I certainly support that fully. It is highly essential that this channel be dredged so that these tankers can get in and out of Richmond Harbor, which is an adjunct of San Francisco Bay.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Miller.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, this project is considered so important by the city of Richmond that although 1 representative is going to testify for 3, I want to introduce others who are here.

This is Mr. Al Cannon, the acting mayor of Richmond.

And this is Mr. Howell, the city manager.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Howell. We are glad to see both of you gentlemen.

Mr. BALDWIN. They consider it so important that they have come all the way back here on this project, and I just wanted you to meet them.

The presentation for the city of Richmond will be made by Mr. Thomas M. Carlson, the city attorney.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to join Mr. Baldwin in introducing Mr. Carlson. I know he is well known to Mr. Jensen, and I know his statement will be profitable.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Carlson.

Mr. CARLSON. Let me say this. I have prepared and have left on the table, in accordance with what I understand the rules to be, eight copies of a statement that is rather full. I will be brief and read a paragraph from it that I think is important.

First I will say that in 1948, as city attorney of the city of Richmond—I have served 30 years in that capacity—I appeared before the district engineer at Richmond and made the initial presentation with respect to the deepening and dredging of channels and approaches in Richmond Harbor. I also appeared before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors 2 years ago and made the presentation; and before the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives last year.

What has been said by our two Congressmen—and I think it is wonderful that we have bipartisan support. I can say that I know Mr. Miller was a great Congressman, and I know this young man will be a great Congressman.

The thing I think is of tremendous importance that is not usually understood with reference to Richmond is this: We are the second largest port on the Pacific coast in terms of tonnage. Oakland is on San Francisco Bay; and San Francisco is on San Francisco Bay. But these figures, I think, are astounding.

From 1946 to 1950 the port of Richmond averaged 10 million tons of commerce annually. For 1952 the commerce totaled about 14 million tons. According to the latest annual figures available, those released by the Department of the Army, the tonnage for 1953 was

10,287,549 tons as compared to 2,547,697 tons for the same year for the port of Oakland and 2, 461,786 tons for the same year for the port of San Francisco. In other words, in 1953 the port of Richmond had more than double the combined tonnages of Oakland and San Francisco or approximately five times as much tonnage as either of her sister ports, Oakland and San Francisco.

Now, then, Richmond, as Congressman Jensen knows, was the locality in which about 30 percent of the ships were built during the war period. We have in that area—and I have listed them—a number of industries that are suppliers of goods that are tremendously important in the national interest, and these suppliers use these ports.

In order to test this thing out, I went out on a tanker that came from Malaya and was told by the captain that in order to get into the port of Richmond sometimes the delay is 48 hours, and the cost of those 48 hours runs into thousands and thousands of dollars.

I think, in view of the fact this has been under the scrutiny of the Board of Army Engineers for the time it has been, and in view of the emergency that exists, if you will put $1 million in the budget for this project you will be serving the national interest.

Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Carlson, and your full statement will be made a part of the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

My name is Thomas M. Carlson. I am city attorney for the city of Richmond, Calif., and am now serving my 30th year in that capacity. I am fully conversant with the improvements recommended by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors with respect to the deepening and dredging of channels and approaches in Richmond Harbor, having conducted the initial hearing before the district engineer at Richmond in July, 1948, and having participated in the several subsequent discussions and hearings, culminating with the hearing before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at Washington in March of 1953. I also participated in the hearings before the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, held in Washington June 28, 1954. As you are aware, the 83d Congress authorized a harbor improvement project for Richmond Harbor, Calif., estimating that the expense of the work would be $2,160,000.

The city of Richmond is in complete agreement with the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers that the various approaches and channels mentioned in their reports be widened and deepened. We believe that the passage of time since 1948 has aggravated the conditions which formed the basis for the original project. It is true that the city of Richmond and its residents receive considerable benefit directly and indirectly from the harbor improvements project; however, it is also true that the project is in the national interest since the industries located on these waterways and serving this area are vitally important in the national interest as well as in the economy of the area.

Some of the industries that utilize the Richmond Harbor area and which are of importance in the national interest are as follows: Butler Manufacturing Co., fabricating steel buildings, welded tanks, special products; Filice & Perrelli Canning Co., processing and packing of fruits and vegetables; GarWood Industries, Inc., manufacturers of truck equipment, including bodies, winches, cranes, derricks; Hall-Scott Motor Division, export packaging; Heckathorn & Co., manufacture of insecticides, weed killers, rodenticides; Hills Bros. Co., food packaging, including special Government packs such as Abandon Ship Rations; International Harvester Co., distributor of parts to repair and renew agricultural and power implements; Pacific Tractor & Implement Co., distributor of agricultural implements; Protective Coatings Corp., manufacturer of roof coating and calking compound; Reaction Products Co., manufacture of chemicals, copper salts, organic compounds; Richfield Oil Corp., distributor of petroleum products; Standard Oil Co., manufacture of petroleum and petroleum byproducts; Steel Processing & Distributing Co., steel slitting and distribution; The Texas Co., gasoline and oil

terminal; Time Oil Co., distributor of petroleum products; Willys Motors, parts for aircraft; and Chase Aircraft Corp., aircraft parts.

Richmond Harbor is one of the deepwater ports of San Francisco Bay. From 1946 to 1950 the port averaged 10 million tons of commerce annually. For 1952 the commerce totaled about 14 million tons. According to the latest annual figures available, those released by the Department of the Army, the tonnage for 1953 was 10,287,549 tons as compared to 2,547,697 tons for the same year for the port of Oakland and 2,461,786 tons for the same year for the port of San Francisco. In other words, in 1953 the port of Richmond had more than double the combined tonnages of Oakland and San Francisco or approximately five times as much tonnage as either of her sister ports, Oakland and San Francisco. Official figures for 1954 are not yet available. It is true that the great bulk of this tonnage for Richmond is oil.

My remarks are purposefully brief because the findings and recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, supported by the detailed report of the district engineer, San Francisco district, ably and fully sets forth the need for the improvements and the benefits to be derived therefrom.

The committee should know that E. C. Itschner, brigadier general, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, in reply to an inquiry made by Hon. John F. Baldwin, Member of Congress for the Sixth District of California, has estimated the amount of funds which could profitably be expended for the Richmond Harbor project in the fiscal year 1956 in these words:

"Funds in the amount of $1 million could be profitably expended in fiscal year 1956 of which $323,000 would be applied to dredging the channel in Southampton Shoal and the approach area to the Richmond long wharf, and the balance used to initiate work under a continuing contract for dredging the inner harbor and entrance channel."

The city of Richmond most strongly urges that the proposed widening and deepening of the channels and approaches go forward without delay and that the sum of $1 million be appropriated therefor for the fiscal year 1956. An additional appropriation of $1,160,000 for the fiscal year 1957 will be required to complete the project.

Mr. BALDWIN. We have as our next witness Mr. Robert F. Donoghue, who represents the Pacific American Tankship Association.

Mr. Donoghue.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Donoghue.

Mr. DONOGHUE. I am Robert F. Donoghue, a member of the firm of Donoghue & Ragan, attorneys, with offices in the Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C. I am appearing in connection with the Richmond Harbor, Calif., channel project on behalf of the Pacific American Tankship Association which is composed of the following companies, located on the Pacific coast of the United States, owning and operating tankships: General Petroleum Corp., Hillcone Steamship Co., Keystone Shipping Co., Richfield Oil Corp., Standard Oil Company of California, the Texas Co., Tide Water Associated Oil Co., and Union Oil Company of California.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Donoghue, can you summarize your statement for the committee, and then your entire statement will be included in the record?

Mr. DONOGHUE. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to do so.

I subscribe entirely to what Congressmen Baldwin and Miller and our friend, Mr. Carlson, have said about this situation.

I think I might do no better than to just read a couple of paragraphs here.

In 1950, the last year referred to in the Army Engineers' report, contained in House Document No. 395, the commerce in petroleum and its products totaled about 10,500,000 tons and the general-cargo commerce was in excess of 360,000 tons. The presently authorized project provides for channels varying from 30 to 32 feet in depth with a minimum width of 400 feet except that the minimum width in Santa Fe Channel

is 200 feet. The present authorized depth and width of these channels cannot safely accommodate the larger size vessels constructed during and since the war.

The last improvements to the areas covered by the project report were made in 1941. Since that time the size and draft of vessels, both tanker and dry cargo, have very materially increased. For example, during the war, the Maritime Commission built the T2 tankers which became the predominant type vessel used in carrying petroleum. These vessels had a carrying capacity of approximately 16,500 tons and had a draft of slightly in excess of 30 feet.

One of the dangers that Congressman Miller pointed out is evidenced in an excerpt from a letter dated April 23, 1953, from the Standard Oil Company of California to the Office of Chief of Engineers, as follows:

> In the meantime, the situation becomes more critical each day. As an example of this, early this month the inadequacy of water depth in the approaches to our Richmond Long wharf very nearly caused a serious accident. A loaded 24,200-deadweight-ton tanker, with a mean summer draft of over 32 feet, was approaching the wharf when the lack of water beneath the vessel caused it to take a sudden sheer. Fortunately, this sheer was away from the wharf. Had it been toward the wharf, as it could just as well have been, the results would probably have been disastrous. It is quite likely that fire would have resulted with the strong possibility of loss of life, to say nothing of the certainty of serious damage to the vessel and this highly important oil terminal.

The Army engineers have recommended that an appropriation of $1 million be made for fiscal year 1956, which recommendation we feel should be followed.

May I say one further thing. Mr. Ralph E. Dewey was here representing the Pacific American Steamship Association, which is composed of dry-cargo operators. He asked me to express his comments on this briefly, in that he agreed with everything we have in our statement, everything Mr. Carlson has in his statement, and the remarks of Congressman Baldwin and Congressman Miller. He is interested in the widening and deepening of the channel because it affects his dry-cargo vessels as much as it affects our tankers.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Donoghue. Your full statement will be included in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF PACIFIC AMERICAN TANKSHIP ASSOCIATION

RICHMOND HARBOR, CALIF.

I am Robert F. Donoghue, a member of the firm of Donoghue & Ragan, attorneys, with offices in the Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C. I am appearing in connection with the Richmond Harbor, Calif., channel project on behalf of the Pacific American Tankship Association which is composed of the following companies, located on the Pacific coast of the United States, owning and operating tankships: General Petroleum Corp., Hillcone Steamship Co., Keystone Shipping Co., Richfield Oil Corp., Standard Oil Co. of California, The Texas Co., Tide Water Associated Oil Co., Union Oil Co., of California.

The modification of the existing project for Richmond Harbor, Calif., to provide for deepening and enlarging the channel, as explained in House Document No. 395, 83d Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,086,000 was authorized by the Congress in Public Law 780, 83d Congress, 2d session.

The city of Richmond is an industrial area depending greatly upon its harbor facilities. The refining and distribution of petroleum is the largest industry in the area. The Standard Oil Co. maintains a large oil refinery and storage and distribution centers, and petroleum products are shipped from its plant to

various points along the Pacific coast and the Far East. Richfield Oil Corp. operates an oil-distribution terminal in the inner harbor and The Texas Co. has recently completed a large distribution terminal on the Santa Fe Channel. The Ford Motor Co. has operated a large assembly plant in Richmond, and other important manufactures are fishmeal and oil, canned fruits and vegetables, chemicals, machinery, steel containers, and lumber products. During World War II, four large shipyards were also operated at Richmond by the Maritime Commission.

In 1950, the last year referred to in the Army engineers' report, contained in House Document No. 395, the commerce in petroleum and its products totaled about 10,500,000 tons and the general-cargo commerce was in excess of 360,000 tons. The presently authorized project provides for channels varying from 30 to 32 feet in depth with a minimum width of 400 feet except that the minimum width in Santa Fe Channel is 200 feet. The present authorized depth and width of these channels cannot safely accommodate the larger size vessels constructed during and since the war.

The last improvements to the areas covered by the project report were made in 1941. Since that time the size and draft of vessels, both tanker and dry cargo, have very materially increased. For example, during the war, the Maritime Commission built the T2 tankers which became the predominant type vessel used in carrying petroleum. These vessels had a carrying capacity of approximately 16,500 tons and had a draft of slightly in excess of 30 feet.

The initial hearing on this project was held at Richmond on July 28, 1948. Since that hearing, the trend toward larger and deeper draft vessels has made the situation increasingly critical from the standpoints of safety of navigation and costly vessel delays. For example, vessels of 38,000 deadweight tons, drawing in excess of 33 feet of water, now discharge their cargo at the Richmond Long wharf while the T2's continue, under difficulties, to use the facilities of the inner harbor. Delays of from 4 to 9 hours in docking the vessels are not uncommon in such circumstances. An instance of the dangers inherent in the present depth of water at the Richmond Long wharf is reflected in an excerpt from a letter dated April 23, 1953, from the Standard Oil Co. of California to the Office of Chief of Engineers as follows:

"In the meantime, the situation becomes more critical each day. As an example of this, early this month the inadequacy of water depth in the approaches to our Richmond Long Wharf very nearly caused a serious accident. A loaded 24,200-deadweight-ton tanker, with a mean summer draft of over 32 feet, was approaching the wharf when the lack of water beneath the vessel caused it to take a sudden sheer. Fortunately, this sheer was away from the wharf. Had it been toward the wharf, as it could just as well have been, the results would probably have been disastrous. It is quite likely that fire would have resulted, with the strong possibility of loss of life, to say nothing of the certainty of serious damage to the vessel and this highly important oil terminal."

While the authorized project contemplates the expenditure of $2,086,000, we are not requesting that the full amount be authorized for fiscal year 1956. The Army engineers have estimated that during the approaching fiscal year, if an appropriation of $1 million were obtained, the sum of $323,000 would be applied to dredging the channel in Southampton Shoal and the approach area to the Richmond Long Wharf and the balance used to initiate work for dredging the inner harbor and entrance channel. We feel that the Army engineers' estimate of the work that can be profitably done during the fiscal year 1956 is a sound one, and we respectfully request that your committee recommend favorable consideration of an appropriation in the amount of $1 million for the necessary work for Richmond Harbor, Calif., authorized by Public Law 780, referred to above.

We appreciate the courtesy of being permitted to appear before your committee on this matter.

Mr. JENSEN. The only thing that comes to my mind in this connection, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that these tankers and ships are becoming larger and larger every year, and naturally heavier, and need a greater depth of water. I am wondering if any of the shipbuilders or shipowners ever stop to think before they start to build these great big ships that they will have some problems to contend with as far as docking is concerned.

I asked a question the other day as to whether the shipbuilders and shipowners were giving any thought to building these ships in such a manner that they would not need to have deeper waters in which to dock by perhaps making the ship more blunt instead of to a point. Every ship designer is like an architect or an engineer. He wants to build a bigger and better ship than was ever built before, just as an architect wants to build the biggest building, and an engineer wants to build the biggest bridge; that is wonderful; that is progress; but where is it going to end? If we deepen these channels in order to accommodate you folk, looking into the future I can see you coming back in the next 5 or 10 years and saying they have to be still deeper. Where are we going to stop? Do you not think you had better start thinking about how you can build heavier ships that can operate in 30 feet of water without coming to us constantly and asking us to deepen your channels?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Jensen, a good many of these ships are subsidized by the Government as a part of our defense. You remember last year we passed a bill to get rid of ships that were 10 years old and offered to pay part of the cost of new ones if they met the specifications of the Navy, because the Navy needs them so vitally in the event of an emergency. That is the thing that pretty well establishes the standards, the standards established by the Government.

Mr. JENSEN. But, my wonderful colleague from California, that is not answering the problem this committee and Congress is going to have to deal with.

Mr. MILLER. I know it is not, but I think it puts us in the position of saying that is what one part of the Government wants, and certainly these big tankers are not going to do us any good in time of war.

Mr. DONOGHUE. I am not very good on the technical aspects. I believe from what I have heard that if we had the broader vessel that you have described it lessens the speed, and the speed in a tanker, so far as defense is concerned, is the important element.

Mr. BALDWIN. It seems to me that we have to accept the situation as it exists. The trend toward larger tankers was started by the Maritime Commission during World War II. Those are the tankers that are sailing the sea, and we have to recognize the existing conditions, just as the highway departments have to recognize that larger trucks are on the roads.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree with that perfectly. I am looking further in the future. I am hoping some shipbuilder can come up with a design that will not require greater channel depth than we have to go to now in order to accommodate the ships we have to accommodate. Of course we have to accommodate them; there is no question about that, and we will, but my anxiety is over what is going to happen. Are you going to continue building them bigger and bigger?

Mr. BALDWIN. Obviously we cannot answer that question.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, gentlemen.

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1955.

SOLANO PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

WITNESSES

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

E. H. UHL, REPRESENTING THE SOLANO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

HOWARD STODDARD, ENGINEER, REPRESENTING THE SOLANO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND SOLANO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Baldwin, we will be glad to hear you and the witnesses you present on the Solano project.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Solano project involves the construction of a large dam in the Monticello Canyon. I know you gentlemen are very familiar with the background.

Thirteen million dollars has been included in the President's budget and approved by the Bureau of the Budget for this project.

This is an important year for this project. It is well on its way. This is the year when the main dam is to be built. It is essential from the standpoint of best timing that the dam be built and, simultaneously with it, that construction begin on a diversion dam down the channel and on the main canal so that when the dam is completed and water starts backing up, the diversion dam will also be ready to use.

The budget submitted by the President contains $13 million for this project. We actually think more than that is needed to proceed rapidly enough on the diversion dam and the main canal, but we are not here asking for more. We are here simply to stress the importance of this full $13 million budgetary recommendation of the President, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, for this project. This will practically complete the dam and enable a start to be made on the diversion dam and the main canal. If those starts were not made, the supervisory reclamation personnel would be very poorly used, whereas if those two projects can be started while the main dam is being built you will not waste the time of those trained people.

We have two witnesses from Solano County. I would like to introduce first Mr. Ed Uhl, who is a grower and who has been very active on this project over the years. He was sent here by the board of supervisors of Solano County, and he has a statement to make to the committee.

Mr. EVINS. Very well, Mr. Uhl. We will be glad to hear you.

Mr. UHL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is E. H. Uhl. I am appearing in support of the appropriation for the Solano project in California.

My appearance before this commitee is authorized by, and on behalf of, the board of supervisors of Solano County, as well as for the Solano County Water Council, of which I am an executive committee member. The board of supervisors of my county also serves as the Solano County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The Solano County Flood Control and Water Conservation District was

established by special act in 1951 by the California Legislature, and is in the nature of a master type of conservancy district with authority to contract with the United States and, in turn, with irrigation districts and municipalities to be furnished water from the Solano project. In many respects, the Solano projectwide district is similar to the Santa Barbara County Water Agency which was also established by California law to serve as the master district contracting agency for the Cachuma project.

My occupation is farming. For the last 37 years I have been growing a wide variety of crops in the service area of the Solano project. I have irrigated, and I have dry-farmed. I have raised livestock, deciduous fruits, hay, and grain. At present, I own and lease 1,080 acres of dry farming within the boundaries of the Solano Irrigation District, or adjacent thereto. Further, I own and lease 1,200 acres of irrigated crops in another irrigation district located in the eastern portion of Solano County. Ever since the Solano project was first proposed some 32 years ago, I have followed its progress. This is my 16th appearance before the legislative committees considering its authorizations and appropriations. This experience surely qualifies me to give this committee the facts relating to the need for appropriating the full amount of $13 million which is in the President's budget for this project for the fiscal year 1955–56.

The Solano project consists of a multiple-purpose dam known as the Monticello Dam, the reservoir having a capacity of 1,600,000 acre-feet; a diversion dam; a main distribution canal approximately 38 miles long; and an irrigation distribution system. The project will provide a firm annual yield of 262,000 acre-feet of water, of which about 90 percent will be diverted to agricultural use and 10 percent to municipal, industrial, and domestic use. There are incidental flood-control benefits to be derived from the project, but there is no public power feature. The total cost is $47,111,000 which is 98 percent reimbursable. Only $1,132,000 is allocated to flood control, which is nonreimbursable.

The first appropriation for construction was $2,800,000 for fiscal 1953–54. We are now spending the balance of $7 million for fiscal 1954–55. Thirteen million is in the budget for the next fiscal year.

Now, just a short reference to present construction. At this time, the bridge just below the dam site is completed and the relocation of Highway No. 128 is to be completed this fall. The tunnel is finished and water is now bypassing through the same. The dam excavation is now under way and cement will start to pour by July 1 this year. Completion date for the dam is October 1956, and the contractor states there will be no difficulty in meeting that deadline. Our concern is that construction may lag and become more costly. It had been my hope that the diversion dam and main canal of 38 miles would have been completed when the dam was finished. In that case, construction cost would have been less, and water users could have purchased water at least 1 and perhaps 2 years earlier.

Please bear in mind our need for water is ever increasing and each year of delay is damaging to our welfare and progress. We are now faced with the third year of a dry cycle. At this date, our rainfall is about 65 percent of normal. The water table has been receding for many years. This is caused mainly by the recent phenomenal growth

in the population of the county. From 1940 to 1950, the population increase of Solano County was 114 percent. From 1950 to 1952, Vallejo increased an additional 34 percent. During the last 15 years, Fairfield and Vacaville have more than tripled in population. Solano County is also a critical defense area. The national interest demands that the water needs of the Travis Air Force Base, with a strength of over 12,000, and of the great Mare Island Naval Shipyard, with a military and civilian force of no less than 23,000, must be met. It is essential for us to bring to mind that Mare Island Navy Yard had 42,000 persons on V–J Day, and was set up for a total, if need be, of 47,000.

The demand for water by the farmer is even more acute. In 1932, there were 332 irrigation wells in the service area of the Solano project. Now, with a falling water table, there are today more than 1,250. My own experience in attempting to produce crops without irrigation has been a nightmare. Without sufficient water for irrigation, our economy shows up on the minus side of the ledger.

Inasmuch as the United States and Solano County have actually entered into a contract whereby it is agreed that the Federal Government is to build this project, and we are now in the third year of construction, it would not be good business for either of these parties for the Congress to make any reduction on this appropriation now being discussed. In fact, if it were within your power so to do, the appropriation should be increased so that the entire works could be completed by October 1956 so repayment could commence by the spring of 1957.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, instead of reading these letters I would like to have inserted in the record a copy of my letter of February 3, 1955, to the President and the answer to the same.

Mr. EVINS. They may be received. I take it the letters support your statement.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

VACAVILLE, CALIF., *February 3, 1955.*

Re Solano project in California.

The PRESIDENT,
White House, Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The President's budget for the fiscal year 1955–56 provides $13 million for the continued construction of the Solano project. This is approximately $2½ million short of important accomplishments. Under the existing circumstances, it is expected the main dam will be completed October 1956. Consequently, the United States Government and Solano County are confronted with the following situation:

1. The stored water behind the dam (due to lack of funds) will be without a diversion dam and main canal. Therefore, water could not be used until the summer of 1958.

2. Water users will be held back 2 years whereas they need the water now.

3. Repayment to the United States Government likewise will be delayed 2 years.

4. Water users must repay every dollar and are concerned about a probable excessive cost of the canal and diversion dam unless it can be constructed while the Bureau of Reclamation has its present staff of approximately 100 field and office personnel.

5. Several individual studies indicate that $10 million additional revenue will be derived from these 100,000 acres (exclusive of industry) under full irrigation developments. Each year of delay prevents the water users from receiving this additional income, and consequently, the Federal Government would be deprived of several million dollars in taxes.

Would you seriously reconsider allocating additional funds for this project, so that the United States and Solano County will benefit at least 2 years earlier?

My deep concern is not only because I have a variety of farming in this county, but also because I have represented Solano County at some 15 hearings in Washington, and therefore, I am fully cognizant of this entire prlobem.

Whatever you can do for us will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

E. H. UHL.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington 25, D. C., March 3, 1955.

Mr. E. H. UHL,
Solano County, Vacaville, Calif.

DEAR MR. UHL: Your letter of February 3, 1955, to the President regarding additional funds for the Solano project has been referred to this Bureau for reply.

You will realize, of course, that requests for construction of water resources projects to be included in the 1956 budget were far in excess of those which the current fiscal situation would permit us to recognize. Consequently, it was necessary to limit budget recommendations for going projects such as Solano to amounts estimated by the agency as required to meet the most economical construction schedules that could be provided. With respect to the diversion dam mentioned in your letter, it was considered that this is a relatively small structure which can be completed by fiscal year 1957, with the funds that are included in the 1956 budget for starting this work toward the end of the 1956 fiscal year. We have been advised that under the most recently revised construction schedules, initial water deliveries would be made by July 1957. To the extent that any reductions in cost are realized in constructing the Monticello Dam and Reservoir, we understand the Department would plan to apply the savings toward construction of the diversion dam and canals.

We fully appreciate your interest in the project and the importance of irrigation water supplies for the area.

Sincerely yours,

CARL H. SCHWARTZ, JR.,
Chief, Resources and Civil Works Division.

Mr. UHL. I wish to conclude by saying that it is very much to our mutual benefit if this committee will appropriate every dollar as submitted in the President's budget for this project during the 1955–56 fiscal year.

Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Uhl.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, as the second delegate from Solano County, we have with us Mr. Howard Stoddard, an engineer, who comes as a representative of the Solano County Board of Supervisors and the Solano Irrigation District.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Stoddard, we will be glad to hear you.

Mr. STODDARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a statement to make except to say I agree in full with Mr. Uhl's presentation. I know this committee is well aware of the economies that are brought about by carrying on an orderly construction program. That is what we want, and that is why we feel at least the full $13 million included in the budget should be appropriated.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Stoddard.

I would like to thank Congressman Baldwin, our colleague, for arranging these hearings.

You support the full amount in the budget, but do you desire to build the diversion dam concurrently with the other dam?

Mr. BALDWIN. We are informed that the amount included in the budget will make possible the construction of the main dam in ac-

cordance with the time schedule of the Reclamation Bureau and will also make it possible for them to start the diversion dam and for them to start the canal. It is not necessary for the Appropriations Committee to make any specific allocation as far as the $13 million is concerned. The $13 million makes it possible not only to continue the construction of the main dam, but for the reclamation people to start the diversion dam and the canal, and by that coordinated effort they will be able to use their construction personnel to best advantage. That is extremely important. There is no need for any breakdown as far as the Appropriations Committee is concerned. This $13 million will allow that orderly procedure which we feel is so important at this time.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say I appreciate the fine statement our colleague has made. He has a fine grasp of the situation and has explained it very distinctly as to what he hopes can be accomplished and what he hopes the committee will do, as well as has Mr. Uhl. I have known Mr. Uhl for a good many years. I remember the time Mr. Uhl came before this committee when matters were not as harmonious as they are now, but Mr. Uhl was determined and so the committee decided this was a very worthwhile project and we appropriated money for it. I do not know how many years ago that was but I remember very distinctly the many sessions we had with Mr. Uhl across the table. I want to say it is nice to see you again, Mr. Uhl.

Mr. UHL. Thank you. It is nice to see you.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, gentlemen, and thank you Congressman Baldwin.

Mr. BALDWIN. Thank you. We know it has been a long day and we appreciate the time you have given us.

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1955.

POWER IN THE NORTHWEST

WITNESSES

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEAN BARLINE, DIRECTOR OF UTILITIES, TACOMA, WASH.
JACK D. STEVENS, CONSULTING ENGINEER, SEATTLE, WASH.
T. W. ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN, UTILITIES BOARD, TACOMA, WASH.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be in order.

We are pleased to have appearing before us at this time our colleague, Hon. Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington, and I will ask you to present the other members of your group with you, Mr. Pelly.

Mr. PELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I would like to express my appreciation to the committee for allowing me this time and the other representatives from the Pacific Northwest, to give our views in connection with the appropriations having to do with the power for our area.

My district is the First District in the State of Washington which includes the Seattle and Kitsap Counties.

In that district I have municipally owned and operated plants, the Seattle City Light, and Kitsap County, I have the Puget Sound, a private company.

Both of these power and distributing concerns are members of the Puget Sound Utility Council which is a rather unique group in that instance, in that they consist of the Chelan County Public Utility District No. 1, the Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1, and 1 or 2 county utilities; two cities, Seattle City Light, and Tacoma City Light, and the Puget Sound Power & Light Co.

They are closely knit together and work and coordinate their efforts toward solving of the power problems in that area.

Today, I have representatives from that group who would like to appear and testify.

This first gentleman is Dean Barline, from the city of Tacoma, of the department of public utilities.

Mr. Jack Stevens, consulting engineer of Seattle, Wash., and Mr. Anderson.

First, I would like, if I may, to call upon Mr. Barline to testify.

Mr. BARLINE. Mr. Anderson is to lead off.

Mr. PELLY. Very well, Mr. Anderson will express first the views of the group that he represents.

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to hear you, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to thank the committee for the opportunity of coming before you to give you our views on the activities in the area, and to state that we support the Bonneville Power budget and the Corps of Engineers' budget.

First, I would like to tell you a little bit about the background of the area, which I think may be advisable to you in view of some of the questions that have been brought up in past years.

First, the power pool in the Northwest is a group of operating utilities that are coordinated with the Bonneville Power Administration, and they are formed of the Puget Sound Power & Light, Seattle City Light, and the city of Tacoma Light. And on the lower end of the State of Washington; and we have on the eastern end, the Puget Sound and the Pacific Power & Light, a part of General Electric system, and the Bonneville Power, to the east.

And may I observe that all of these utilities are integrated together with a system of tie-ins and grids, and interconnecting transmission facilities to do their utmost to utilize all of the power potential in the area.

It is a voluntary group in which they exchange power and store water for one another; if one utility is not using water, they can generate their electricity and send it over to some other utility, where it is not using the water that is stored in the reservoir. We integrate and exchange power and storage of water in order to get the utmost use of the power from the available resources.

We also have the Northwest Utility Conference Committee which is composed of all of the utilities and the operating public utilities and private operators in the area. I might say that the pool itself was established in 1942. In 1946 a conference committee was set up as a means of getting the utilities together to make a study of the problems to help the Bonneville Power Administration to determine the availability of power and in the event of curtailment of these utilities, to affect where you would expect a reduction in avail-

ability of power from the Bonneville system; and also to unite in the efforts to support the budgets of the Corps of Engineers and the Bonneville Power Administration.

We have another group that was formed in 1953—or was it 1954?

Mr. BARLINE. In 1954.

Mr. ANDERSON. Consisting of the Seattle and the Tacoma City Light; the Puget Sound Power & Light; the Snohomish County Public Utility and the Chelan County Public Utility District.

These utilities are more concentrated in the Puget Sound and Cascade areas.

We feel that the problem in our area is one of coordinating these utilities, of getting both new producing utilities and trying to develop the utilities in our area to their utmost capability.

I would like to read 1 or 2 of the declarations of the objectives of the Puget Sound Utility Council, Nos. 1 and 5.

No. 1, to take care of the total electric power needs of the Puget Sound and Cascade Area for all purposes, including the industrial growth, which we intend to do.

That objective was set up when it was found that we could no longer except the Government to assume all the responsibility of providing power in this area.

Objective No. 5: These utilities agree to explore ways and means as to how, on a broad base, to foster the expansion of our economy by the creation of more jobs, larger payroll, and help serve industry and all other groups in the Puget Sound and Cascade areas.

The council generally meets in Seattle once a month, where we get together to talk over the problems.

We have as members of the council engineers who study the natural resources of the area, the demonstrated load, the means of tying in and exchanging power in the area, and to come up with recommendations as to how we can best proceed, individually and collectively, together on the matter of any new starts that might be developed.

I have a map here which shows the areas, service areas, of Puget Sound-Cascade region. I think I can proceed best by passing to each of you gentlemen a copy of this report which has been prepared.

Mr. BARLINE. May I suggest that you make it a part of the record.

Mr. ANDERSON. And I would like to have it made a part of the record.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will accept the report for its use, without introducing it into the printed record.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is a map which is just ahead of page 1 of this particular program report, which I have just handed to you.

On pages 2 and 3 we have a tabulation of the powerload, giving the actual statistics of the region; this also gives the population and other statistical data on the Puget Sound-Cascade region.

Then on page 33, to which I would like to refer you in that report, is shown the council load and the estimated minimum load level from 1954 to 1963.

There is a tabulation from 1940 to 1953, showing the annual energy in billion kilowatt-hours. Also a tabulation showing the winter peak, giving the estimated load projected to 1963.

On page 43 is another tabulation, showing the loads and resources of the west group utilities of the Northwest power pool, assuming

critical hydro conditions, and minimum load levels, and this tabulation is from 1954–55 through 1964–65.

You will note at the very bottom of the tabulation the item mentioned earlier: Area surplus.

In 1954–55, we have a minus 50, and in practically every year except 1958–59, we have a minus quantity; this is shown in thousands of kilowatts. There is only 1 year shown here when there is a surplus, and that is a very small surplus.

Then on page 49 we have listed a table, No. 17, giving the council projects under investigation, with possible dates of initial operation, which shows the Mayfield Dam; the city of Tacoma is presently calling for bids on it, and it is intended to have construction started within a 2-month period.

Cushman No. 3 is a project which involves reserve storage.

The next project is Upper Baker.

Then we come to Mossy Rock, the second power project in the region of the city of Tacoma which will produce around 300,000 kilowatts.

The next project is Boundary, operated by the city of Seattle, with a capacity of 265,000.

Another project is the Lower Baker, a Puget Sound Power & Light project, with 55,000 kilowatts.

And then the Wenatchee, being operated by the Chelan County Public Utility District, with a capacity of 110,000 kilowatts.

The Sultan, another project by the Snohomish County Public Utility District with 111,000 kilowatts.

Then the Rocky Reach, which is also being studied by the Chelan Utility District.

Then we also have a project which we have worked out with the Canadian Government on the question of storage, and the degree by which it might provide more storage than the Grand Coulee Dam by about twice.

Then I would like to refer you to plate No. 6, opposite page 50, which shows the long-range power situation analysis, giving the present hydroelectric plants, the plants now under construction, the plants proposed by the Puget Sound Utility Council for investigation, firm purchases from Bonneville Power Administration and firm purchases from industrial plants.

That, gentlemen, will give you a brief rundown of the activities of the Puget Sound Utility Council.

I would like now to call on Mr. Jack Stevens, consulting engineer for the Puget Sound Utility Council, who will present a statement in connection with the Bonneville Power, and Army engineers' budgets.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Stevens, we will be glad to hear you at this time.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, this is a statement to the Subcommittee for the Western Area of the Subcommittee on Public Works.

The Puget Sound Utilities Council consists of Seattle City Light, Tacoma City Light, Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1, and Chelan County Public Utility District No. 1. They own and operate powerplants that have a combined peaking capability of 1.6 million kilowatts. In addition, they all have long-term, firm power contracts for the purchase of power from the Federal Columbia River power system. The council utilities serve a population of 1,530,000 persons, 60 percent of the

State of Washington. Annual income is about $64 million and total assets are over one-half billion dollars. The utilities are now investigating 8 hydroelectric projects, totaling 2.8 million kilowatts.

The five public and private electric-power utilities comprising the Puget Sound Utilities Council have examined the fiscal year 1956 budgets of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior. The utilities believe that all of the budget items are necessary and that the budgets of the respective agencies represent minimum requirements. The council urges, therefore, that no reductions be made in the budgets presented by these two agencies.

The power program of the Puget Sound Utilities Council is closely coordinated with the resources and power operations of all Northwest utilities and agencies directly, or indirectly, associated with the operations of the Northwest power pool. The budgetary items proposed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bonneville Power Administration are consistent with the development of regional resources and power operations.

The Puget Sound Utilities respectfully requests approval by the Subcommittee of Public Works of the Appropriations Committee, of the fiscal year 1956 budgets of the Corps of Engineers and the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Stevens, you are appearing in support, and in behalf, of the Puget Sound group for the budget recommended funds for the Corps of Engineers and the Bonneville Power Administration!

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. That is the some position that the others have taken.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Am I correct in that you are not recommending any greater sum than the budgeted amount?

Mr. STEVENS. May I put it this way, Mr. Chairman, that we have examined the presentation of the two agencies and the engineers feel that those are the minimum budgets and in line with the statement made, the recommendation is that they not be cut.

Mr. BARLINE. I might add, if I may, Mr. Chairman, that the members of the Puget Sound Utility Council have met with the members of the Northwest Conference Committee and with members of the corps before we came to Washington, and we are in accord with the statement that these are bare minimum budgeted figures.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Anderson, how many public and private utility groups and conferences do you have in the area? Just as a matter of record, you have the Northwest power pool and you have the Northwest Conference Committee, and you are in the Puget Sound group. What other groups would you mention?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think that, basically, is the entire picture. But I wanted to try to bring out that the pool system is an operating group.

Mr. EVINS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. And we have a conference committee, and we have the Puget Sound utility group.

Mr. EVINS. The Puget Sound utility operating, or nonoperating, tied in with the Northwest Conference Committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. There were some charges to the groups in the area. The conference committee was operated by the utilities on a mutual basis. We operate on a nonpaid basis from our group.

Now, later on, in 1954, early in 1954, they set up a different type of organization in which they employed a paid manager for this group.

We, in the city of Tacoma, felt that if we were going to contribute toward the budget, that would be roughly $30,000 a year, that we would better our activities and promote our interests in the area better by getting these utilities that are in the same economic area to work more closely together, to study the resources of the area, to study the advantages of steam generation which could be worked out together as a group, and also to study the possibilities of atomic energy in the area.

Mr. EVINS. You are not in conflict with the Northwest Conference Committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; we are not.

Mr. EVINS. And you are actually supporting both of these budgets?

Mr. ANDERSON. And many of our members meet with their group and work with them, but we just felt that we would be better off to establish this other group.

Mr. EVINS. You, in effect, are a region within a region?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right.

Mr. BARLINE. And may I add to that, Mr. Chairman, that there are two members, two PUDS, that are members of the Puget Sound Council that have not, at any time, ever been members of the conference committee. One of them, the Snohomish PUD has some 40,000 customers which you can readily see is a large operation.

Also the Puget Sound Council has a hired engineer and we are working together on a very close basis, doing whatever we can to try to coordinate each of the activities; and we are all working together to make it possible to bring in enough generation to meet the power demands in the area.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. MURRAY. I was just wondering about the relationship to this Northwest power pool group. As I understood the presentation of the pictures to the committee, they demonstrate a program of what I understood to be the entire Northwest area for a period up to and including, I think, 1965, which did show a considerable participation by the Federal Government. I was wondering if you are aware of that program, and if, since you do represent a considerable portion of the Northwest area, whether you also took into consideration, or contemplated the needs of the area, and whether there would be participation between the groups.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARLINE. First, I would like to state that it was not the Northwest pool that was here; that was the conference committee which is an entirely different group. They are members, and are very active members, of the council. However, they do meet with us on an areawide basis; as far as Federal participation is concerned, we feel that it is absolutely necessary that we have these projects, because our load is beyond the point where we can strain our facilities to meet the demand.

The Tacoma plant, for instance, is worth about $60 million, depreciated value, if it were to go on the market today and we are having

to provide about $45 million for that; and we have nother $90 million to $100 million financing job, and we are rapidly going to reach the place where we cannot go beyond our present basis without some assistance. That is in support of the statement that was made earlier, that we cannot act independently, and therefore, we are in accordance with the statement that we are very definitely in need of assistance from the Federal Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think you wanted to know whether we had the information that you referred to.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have been furnished the data from all the utilities to be incorporated in the statement; it is all combined.

Mr. MURRAY. Their statement to you does reflect your present capabilities and your planned capabilities; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. We furnished that information to them, and when they made the statement to you, it was included. That includes the capability requirements, proposed and projected.

Mr. MURRAY. Thank you.

Mr. HAND. This is a very attractive and obviously a very expensive brochure, no doubt intended to attract more industries to the area.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; we have been authorized to distribute this report to industrial users and potential industries that would come to the area; also for aid in financing, to bond people, who are in the business of financing this type of development.

Mr. HAND. So, in effect, the more power you get developed, with Federal assistance, the more consumers you try to bring in, with the result that you have a constant increase in the demand for power, and therefore, further need for Government assistance; is that about it?

Mr. STEVENS. Of course, this is my report and it does have in it information that would be useful to industry, and also for financial administration and assistance to the various utilities.

Mr. HAND. And equally of interest to bonding houses.

Mr. STEVENS. That is correct. This is a summary of my more detailed report which is a comprehensive report and provides the council group with the type of information needed in connection with the financing and development of a long-range power program.

The recommendations of this report point out that the utilities must be prepared to spend $670 million of their own money in the next 8 years.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Stevens, I am not intending to be critical at all.

Mr. STEVENS. No.

Mr. HAND. But merely to point up the fact that the more power you get, whether with or without Federal assistance, the more you will try to influence others to come in and the more you will try to sell power, and therefore you have a constant shortage of power, and a greater need for power.

Mr. STEVENS. That is right. As you know, we have a very rapidly growing area, particularly in the last decade and a half, and we expect it to grow more rapidly.

Power has been cheap out there, residential consumers use 6,000 kilowatt-hours per year compared with a national average of 2,345 kilowatt-hours. The cost per kilowatt-hour is 1.16 cents compared with a national average of 2.74 cents.

Mr. HAND. I might call your attention to the fact that other areas of the country are contributing their share of the money to build plants that make for cheaper power than you have in your area.

Mr. STEVENS That,. I could not deny.

Of course, in this connection, we are not planning here any governmental expenditures. What we are doing is recommending that the Government go ahead with the completion of projects which are already under construction. The $670 million that I mentioned a moment ago is for building our own new facilities that we will need to supplement our own generation and firm power purchases.

Mr. HAND. Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. PELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity for this group to be heard.

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1955.

REDONDO BEACH, CALIF.

WITNESSES

HON. CECIL R. KING, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

F. E. HOPKINS, CITY MANAGER, REDONDO BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. EVINS. We have with us our good friend and colleague from California, Hon. Cecil R. King, and we will be very pleased to hear you at this time, Mr. King.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

I appreciate deeply the opportunity and privilege of coming back before your committee. I am here today, as in the past, to again present the plight of Redondo Beach, which is a small city in my district, and to urge that your subcommittee recommend an appropriation sufficient so that work may be started on this project, which was authorized in 1950, by the 80th Congress in House Document No. 303.

On August 12, 1953, I submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget a full and up-to-date account of the tragic Redondo Beach situation in my district, and also on October 8, 1954, I submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget a further report, which I would like to insert at this time in the records of this committee if that meets with your approval.

Mr. EVINS. It will be made a part of the record.

(The report referred to follows:)

OCTOBER 8, 1954.

ROWLAND H. HUGHES,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: On August 12, 1953, I submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a full up-to-date account of the tragic Redondo Beach situation in my district, more commonly referred to as the Redondo Beach dilemma, and also submitted a set of "before and after" photographs showing the very serious inroads being made along the waterfront by the ocean, beyond the temporary seawall barriers and into the main street, buildings, and even the utilities of the city of Redondo Beach.

As pointed out, the damage was so serious it received radio, television, and headline attention throughout the United States and even in the Canadian press, and merited "picture of the week" in Life magazine.

What was stressed last year with pictorial proof of the urgent need for the completion of this project, is even further stressed at this time due to the continuing damage and cost to the people as the storms of each succeeding winter take their additional tolls, and the urgency of action becomes greater each year it is delayed.

This project which was originally authorized by the 81st Congress (H. Doc. No. 303) is no longer alone a small boat harbor project, it has become an acute emergency situation as the area is repeatedly ravaged by the ocean storms costing millions of dollars in damage to local property and facilities, despite the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent locally to provide emergency beach protection measures which contribute nothing toward a permanent solution of the problem.

I am again submitting photographs which give a graphic picture of the erosion problem and the subsequent destruction of property:

In the first picture (marked "No. 1") is a view of the beautiful beach shortly after the breakwater was halted for lack of funds in 1939.

The second picture, taken approximately 17 months later, shows the complete erosion of the sand so that little of the sand beach remains. (You will note in the upper right rear of the picture a building marked by an arrow, which is some considerable distance behind the others.) This is the Fox Theater. In the third picture you will note that the boardwalk and all the buildings have been washed away up to the Fox Theater. Pictures 4, 5, and 6 show the damage-dealing waves and the resultant destruction of the dwellings after the 1953 storm. Picture 7 shows a section of the main street in front of the $80 million Edison plant that has been washed away by sea water pouring into new excavations on the site of the expanding Edison plant. Pictures 8 and 9 show the main business section of Redondo shortly after the January 1953 storm with rocks of football size hurled into the street and with the resultant debris and flood damage. Picture No. 10 is an airplane view of Redondo Beach and the breakwater. The waves are bent by the end of the breakwater and refracted so that they approach the beach at express-train speed chopping away at the barricades.

It is pertinent to mention also that during the summer of 1952 all shore-front habitations between Sixth and Beryl Streets were condemned by the California State Health Board and many of the homes and apartments in this area have been evacuated.

It was gratifying when for fiscal year 1955 there was included in the President's budget $50,000 for planning this project, and the Congress appropriated the President's full recommendation to prepare the plan for the construction of this project. The planning will be completed during this fiscal year and construction can be initiated in fiscal year 1956. Therefore, I most strongly urge that the President include funds in the amount of $500,000 in his 1956 budget to the Congress to initiate the construction of this most urgently needed project.

The project serves a dual purpose—in addition to protecting the city of Redondo Beach from the ravages of the ocean, one of the largest concentrations of population in the United States would be served by providing this much-needed sheltered boat harbor. The general benefits to accrue would include the establishment of a harbor with facilities for 700 small craft and the protection and filling of a rapidly eroding section of improved shoreline in front of the city of Redondo Beach evaluated at a benefit-cost ratio of 1.80 to 1. Other benefits, not susceptible of monetary evaluation, include restoration of a blighted area, restoration of business and recreational opportunities and the prevention of further interruption to normal business and home life.

Construction of the authorized project is the only solution to the problem now existing at Redondo Beach with respect to both beach protection and navigation. Any further delay in this already long authorized construction would be pennywise and pound foolish, and this winter the destruction will likely again be equally severe or even worse, requiring commensurate greater expenditures by the people on temporary emergency measures as well as greater cost to permanently correct the situation.

This project has been delayed entirely too long, for directly after I secured its authorization, it was necessary to postpone action on this and other projects, due to the urgency of funds and materials needed for the Korean conflict. Now

that this emergency is past, I cannot too strongly urge recommendation of the appropriation to initiate construction of this vitally needed project.

Very sincerely,

CECIL R. KING,
Member of Congress.

Mr. KING. Gentlemen, I cannot too strongly stress the urgency of the early commencement of work on this project, in light of the fact that each year it is postponed, further damage is done increasing the distress and cost to the people as the storms of succeeding winters take their additional tolls.

It was gratifying that, for the fiscal year 1955, there was included in the President's budget $50,000 for planning this project, and the Congress appropriated the President's full recommendation to prepare the plans for construction. The planning will be completed during this fiscal year and construction can be initiated in fiscal year 1956.

I most strongly urge that this committee recommend the inclusion of $500,000 in the 1956 budget, to initiate the construction of this long-authorized and vital project.

Mr. Chairman, in the past, I have proceeded on my own in this matter, and I thought that perhaps someone directly associated with the city of Redondo should have the privilege of assisting me in giving you a more complete picture, and I am pleased to have with me today Mr. F. E. Hopkins, city manager of the city of Redondo Beach, Calif.

Mr. EVINS. We will be very pleased to hear you, Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. HOPKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With your permission, I would like to present to the committee some photographs which will indicate to you the condition described by Mr. King.

Going back to 1900, Redondo Beach was a major deep water seaport for the entire Los Angeles area. The Santa Fe Railroad and the Pacific Electric Railway both had large shipping docks at Redondo Beach. This continued for a number of years until the San Pedro Harbor was developed because of the requirement for additional facilities for this type of commerce. Of course this diverted all commercial shipping to the San Pedro Harbor.

At that time, it was not thought to be feasible by many engineers to construct a breakwater in Redondo Beach in competition with San Pedro Harbor, but instead to construct a small-crafts harbor which would serve a twofold purpose.

It would not only provide a haven of refuge and anchorage for small craft but would protect the Redondo Beach shoreline from the periodic severe poundings and beach erosion it received as a result of the deep water close in to shore, which made this so adaptable to shipping and harbor purposes, but was always a constant threat to the shoreline because of the storms.

In 1939, in cooperation with the Works Progress Administration and a city bond issue, the initial portion of the breakwater was built.

Mr. HAND. Would you repeat that last statement, please?

Mr. HOPKINS. Certainly.

In cooperation with the Works Progress Administration, in 1939, and a city bond issue, the initial portion of the breakwater was built. Because of the stoppage by this breakwater of the north-south sand drift, this then magnified a very serious erosion problem along the beach with the ever-present danger of severe ocean storms.

In 1949, it was found to be necessary to construct a rock seawall along the beach front to prevent serious damage to public property, streets, and the main trunk sewer line, for the downtown business area is less than one block from the severely eroded waterfront. It is just 1 block to the huge $21 million Edison steam generating station.

The Chief of Army Engineers, in the recommendation to Congress on June 1, 1949, drew the following conclusions:

There is a need for additional small-craft facilities in southern California, particularly in Santa Monica Bay. The proposed harbor development would prevent further erosion of the beach within the harbor area and would result in an overall benefit to shoreline conditions.

The project for navigation by small craft and fishing interest is justified.

The following recommendations were made and the district engineer recommends that a project be adopted to establish a harbor for small-craft navigation at Redondo Beach.

The recommendations of the Corps of Engineers of measures to prevent further property damage and beach erosion have been concurred in by the Los Angeles County engineer and surveyor, the State of California Department of Public Works, and a special Governor's committee, appointed by the Governor of California, to examine the damage to property at Redondo Beach. This committee had, as its members, such eminent engineers as Morough P. O'Brien, dean of the University of California School of Engineering, and a member of the United States Beach Erosion Control Board, assisted by Gerald H. Jones, assistant State engineer, and R. L. Patterson, noted harbor engineer of Newport Beach, Calif.

With the rapid expansion of the Los Angeles International Airport, which is now reputed to have the greatest number of daily takeoffs and landings of any city in the United States, with the exception of New York, all takeoffs are out over the ocean; therefore the necessity for air-sea rescue facilities is growing more apparent daily.

Redondo Beach would be ideally situated for the headquarters of such an operation. It is also well located as a haven of refuge for small craft which could not negotiate the hazardous Catalina Channel during bad weather.

In conclusion, I would like to show these pictures of Redondo Beach, depicting the damage created by the severe ocean storms and beach erosion, and in connection therewith, if this is not published, the wave pattern diagram prepared by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, for the Corps of Engineers, which is not yet ready for public release.

This first picture shows Redondo Beach in 1905 when it was a seaport at Los Angeles. In 1950, there was a severe storm which caused heavy property damage.

At this point, the sand ran out across, north-south and they had a very nice sand beach.

Mr. HAND. What was the cause of that accumulation?

Mr. HOPKINS. The constant north-south silting and the swirls that started away up the coast.

The first picture shows the condition of the beach, shortly after the breakwater was halted in 1939 for lack of funds. This is in the same locality.

Mr. KING. I think perhaps the most important pictures, the ones that show the beautiful strand, and then just a few years later, you can see that the ocean comes right into the city streets.

Mr. HOPKINS. Then on the other side, the business side, is indicated the damage that has occurred through the years, since the erosion.

Then this next picture was taken at the same location, and you will note, as Mr. King pointed out, the beautiful white strand. This is the third picture from the end of this group.

Mr. KING. They are not indicated as to number, but the third picture from the end was taken from the identical spot as this other picture, which would be No. 5, in 1939. The third from the last picture in this group was taken from the same location, as of the present time; was it not?

Mr. HOPKINS. That is correct.

Mr. KING. I have never seen or heard of a more acute beach-erosion problem than this.

Mr. EVINS. Congressman King has spoken to me several times about this situation and I must admit he has certainly emphasized his interest in the project with this exhibition of pictures, and I have been tremendously impressed with the need and the necessity for some work to be done in this area.

As I understand it, all of the planning work has been completed by the Corps of Engineers for this project?

Mr. KING. It is under way this year.

Mr. EVINS. And will be completed this year?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. How many years has this planning work continued?

Mr. KING. Studies have been going on for some 4 years.

Mr. EVINS. 4 years?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. It is your view that within the next fiscal year the Corps of Engineers could move immediately on some construction work if funds were provided?

Mr. KING. They so stated.

Mr. EVINS. That is their recommendation?

Mr. KING. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. But the Bureau of the Budget failed to include funds for this year; is that the situation?

Mr. KING. The Bureau of the Budget's attitude has not changed.

Mr. EVINS. You are recommending $500,000 as the initial appropriation to begin the work, as indicated in this last picture?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Is the scale model of the harbor completed?

Mr. KING. Yes. We have a breakwater that runs out for how many feet, Mr. Hopkins?

Mr. HOPKINS. 2,400, I believe.

Mr. KING. 2,400 feet. We feel, and in fact it has been testified by the Army engineer that that 2,400 feet of breakwater has caused a most unusual whirl, with the resulting damage, and that it should either be removed or extended and completed.

Mr. EVINS. It is not unusual for the committee to go contrary to the Bureau of the Budget when it has received information that action should be taken.

I am going to turn the question over first to our colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Hand, who represents an area on the Atlantic with a problem involving beach erosion.

Mr. HAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have been living and studying beach-erosion problems all my life, and by a curious coincidence, we have a situation that is very much like yours, in my own town.

Mr. KING. Yes; I have heard you mention that.

Mr. HAND. A jetty has been built, and because of the construction of the jetty for a harbor, this situation is accentuated.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. HAND. This is the city on this end and this is the jetty [indicating].

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. HAND. The beach is on this side. Which direction is this?

Mr. HOPKINS. This is south and the jetty is shown out here.

Mr. KING. That is the situation in 1939.

Mr. HAND. How long is this jetty?

Mr. HOPKINS. 2,400 feet.

Mr. HAND. Was that erected by the Federal Government?

Mr. HOPKINS. The original jetty——

Mr. HAND. How much was put up for it?

Mr. HOPKINS. $240,000 was put up by the city and $300,000 by the Government.

Mr. HAND. So in effect the result is pretty much your own fault.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. HAND. Of course, you did not know what the effect would be at the time.

Mr. HOPKINS. That is right.

Mr. HAND. Where is the traffic in and out of this harbor?

Mr. HOPKINS. It comes in and goes out in this direction. This picture [indicating] shows the growing use of the small craft. This is the only access it has in here [indicating].

Mr. HAND. There is no wharf in here [indicating]?

Mr. HOPKINS. No.

Mr. HAND. What do you propose to do with this jetty?

Mr. HOPKINS. Perhaps they would extend it down to deepwater, at this point [indicating].

Mr. HAND. How much more do you plan to add to the present breakwater?

Mr. HOPKINS. About another 2,400 feet, I believe. We have that here in this statement.

Mr. HAND. That is rock, of course?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. HAND. How much do you propose to extend it? Just put the information in the record if you do not have it.

Mr. HOPKINS. We have the exact figures if I can find them.

Mr. HAND. Just supply it for the record.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

The proposed extension of the existing breakwater is 3,144 feet, on contour in water 35 feet deep. Also a groin extending from the shore 700 feet.

Mr. HAND. What is the estimated cost of construction?

Mr. HOPKINS. The latest figure supplied by the Army which is not ready for public release is something over $5 million—$5,650,000, and

the cost to the local interests would be to build the interior work, which would be $2,030,000.

Mr. HAND. That is the cost to local interests?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. HAND. $2,030,000?

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes.

Mr. HAND. And the Federal Government what?

Mr. HOPKINS. It would be $5,650,000.

Mr. HAND. How deep is the water at the point where you plan to extend the present breakwater? Would it be available for ocean traffic?

Mr. HOPKINS. I will have to supply the figures but it would run somewhere approximately 30 feet.

Mr. HAND. What is the population of Redondo Beach?

Mr. HOPKINS. 38,000.

Mr. HAND. Do you happen to know what the assessed valuation is?

Mr. HOPKINS. The total assessed valuation is about $46 million.

Mr. HAND. To be frank with you, would the breakwater be for the purpose of harbor development or for beach erosion problems?

Mr. HOPKINS. It would be a combination, yes.

Mr. HAND. Which do you think is the more important?

Mr. HOPKINS. It would be a little hard to differentiate one from the other, because if you build a harbor, naturally it means increasing the value of the property, those values would change in the area and activity along the harbor front would change.

(Off the record discussion.)

Mr. EVINS. We have another qualified beach expert on this committee, Mr. Murray, from Chicago, who also represents a great beach area.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I was a little disappointed in this from the standpoint that somebody has indicated that we had no beach problem, but in Chicago, I think most everyone knows that we have the most beautiful waterfront in the world, which lies along Lake Michigan, but actually due to the high-water cycle, much of our beaches are under water, not just the result of beach erosion.

I am rather surprised to see that we are being asked to appropriate a considerable amount of money on the basis of beach erosion, when, in Chicago, all we had desired was to take a few buckets out of Lake Michigan for drainage purposes which might have given us a little greater beach without injuring anyone else, and we have not even been allowed to remove that water.

Mr. EVINS. Congressman King, one of the problems with which this committee has been confronted, as pointed out by Mr. Hand, is that the Bureau of the Budget will approve certain requests for funds where the Beach Erosion Board has recommended those funds, but if it is a small boat harbor, or small craft harbor, the situation is different.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. It is on that basis that it has undoubtedly been denied.

Mr. KING. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the residents, generally in Redondo Beach, would be perfectly willing to forgo a boat harbor altogether, more directly replying to Mr. Hand's question.

Mr. EVINS. I was just wondering if you might not be able to get a reclassification of this project, so it would not be classified as a small craft, or a small harbor.

Mr. KING. We have realized the hazard that we were up against, but we wanted to be perfectly frank about it. And I know, before the Senate committee, I had the same problem, but the pictures at the time saved the day, showing that the situation was acute, and at that time, we were helped by Life magazine having pictures of the Redondo Beach situation; they used it as their picture of the week, and they were very helpful.

Mr. Hopkins has shown the committee some pictures. You have another map which I think might indicate a little more clearly the continuing, year after year, pounding, almost pinpointed in this area. This is a most interesting map.

Mr. HAND. Does the breakwater show up on this map?

Mr. HOPKINS. No; it is on too small a scale but it would be right at this point [indicating].

Mr. HAND. Do I understand that the Redondo Beach is publicly owned, municipally owned, or is it a private beach?

Mr. HOPKINS. It is publicly owned. There is a portion down here, southward of the municipal pier, which is owned by the State of California. It is not a privately owned beach.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. King, you have made a most logical and persuasive argument, and I am sure the committee will give very careful consideration to your presentation.

Mr. KING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, gentlemen.

CHANNELIZATION, FLOOD CONTROL, RECLAMATION, AND IRRIGATION PROJECTS

WITNESS

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. EVINS. The committee will please be in order.

We are pleased to have with us at this time Congressman Ellsworth, who has been before this committee on many occasions, and it is a pleasure to have you with us, Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The area I represent in southwest Oregon is approximately one-third of the entire area of the New England States, and I represent approximately 200 miles of coastline and the second largest river basin on the west coast, which means that it is necessary for me to come before this committee every year and urge the appropriation of funds to carry out many authorized projects in this district.

This morning, I want to present the problems of many parts of the district, and to request the appropriation of funds for a number of projects.

COUGAR AND GREEN PETER MULTIPLE-PURPOSE (FLOOD CONTROL)

Two of the most important multiple-purposes flood-control structures in the Willamette comprehensive project are the Cougar and Green Peter Dams. I will discuss them both at the same time since they are especially mentioned in the budget which recommends a total of $3 million to begin construction on these two projects. Of the $3 million, $2 million would be for Cougar and the balance for Green Peter. It is proposed that these projects be built under partnership agreement between the Federal Government and local interests who will furnish about 40 percent of the gross cost of these two structures.

Legislation is pending before the Public Works Committee authorizing partnership on these two projects. It is proposed that the municipal utility of Eugene, Oreg., construct the power facilities at the Cougar project and bear all costs allocated to power. In addition, the Eugene Water and Electric Board would contribute approximately $500,000 toward the cost of the basic flood-control structure and pay part of the annual maintenance cost of the flood-control dam. During the period of the Federal license expected to be granted to the Eugene municipal system, something more than $1 million would be paid toward the maintenance costs of the Federal Government for the basic flood-control structure.

Some 37,500 kilowatts installed electric capacity will be available at the Cougar project. The gross cost of the complete project will be approximately $39,400,000. Under the partnership arrangement the gross cost to the Federal Government will be an estimated $26,877,000—a gross difference of some $12 million. It is interesting to note that the cost of the project under the partnership proposal with power installed will be $1 million less to the Federal Government than if the Federal Government were to build a single-purpose flood-control dam without power. The power produced will be available to the Eugene municipal utility at an amount less than the cost of power purchased from the Bonneville Administration.

The Green Peter multiple-purpose project on the middle Santiam River is very similar to the Cougar project. The flood-control protection needed here is again highly urgent and along with the flood control is a potential 97,000 kilowatts installed hydropower. The gross cost of the project is $58,365,000. Of this gross cost the power facilities alone represent an expenditure of approximately $28 million. Under the legislation mentioned it is proposed that a local partner finance the construction of the power facilities and bear all cost allocated to the power development. The licensee in this instance is expected to be the Pacific Power & Light Co. which is the utility company serving the area in which the dam is located. The construction of both of these projects under the partnership plan would reduce the gross initial cost to the Federal Government by approximately $40 million.

In particular, I want to urge before the committee the extreme and pressing need for the flood-control protection furnished by these two dams. I wish that I might take the committee into this area and show them the ravages of the annual floods through these highly productive, agricultural lands which are so highly productive that they are frequently valued at more than $1,000 per acre for agriculture

purposes and farmers receive incomes of $200 or $300 per acre from the normal crops raised in the area. Many of these valuable farms have been completely destroyed. It is my desire and the desire of the people in these areas that these flood-control structures be built as rapidly as possible. Under the circumstances, I urge with the deepest sincerity that the committee approve at least the funds mentioned in the budget for these two projects and at the same time I wish to urge that the committee will make the appropriation recommendation available on these projects whether the project is built under the partnership plan or whether it is built completely by the Federal Government. In making this plea, I believe that I am stating the sincere feeling of every person and every organization in the areas in which these projects are located. The people in these areas have waited patiently and have done everything within their power, including substantial financial expenditures, to protect themselves against present hazards and to expedite the construction of these projects.

In response to a direct question I have been informed by the Army engineers that detail planning on Cougar Dam and a substantial beginning on construction can be made in fiscal 1956 if funds are provided in this bill. Detail planning for Green Peter Dam can be completed in 1956 if funds are provided. Such appropriations are authorized under existing law.

TALENT DIVISION OF THE ROGUE RIVER PROJECT, OREGON (RECLAMATION AND IRRIGATION PROJECT)

Along with the usual civil functions projects this subcommittee is considering funds for the reclamation and irrigation projects of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Talent division of the Rogue River project was authorized by Public Law 606 of the last Congress. This project was the result of long years of careful study by the Bureau of Reclamation and final approval came at a time when budget estimates for the present budget were being transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget for consideration.

The Talent project is located in the Rogue River Valley of Oregon, which is the best known, if not the greatest, fresh pear marketing area in our country. Perhaps the finest merchandising and marketing of an agricultural product is done by the Bear Creek orchards, under the name of Harry and David, and other pear packers in the region whose beautiful packages are known throughout the Nation and the world. The market for these exceptional pears is expanding and production increases resulting from the water furnished by the Talent project will be readily absorbed.

Although rehabilitation funds were approved in connection with the project, the Bureau of the Budget did not transmit to Congress a recommendation for construction funds. The budget carries the recommendation of $30,000 for further study of the project. After the transmittal of the budget message to the Congress it was discovered that in the haste of transmitting the data concerning this project to the Bureau of the Budget, errors in tabulation of benefits resulted in a set of figures which appeared to make the project questionable to the Bureau of the Budget. It is now clearly indicated

that instead of a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than 1 to 1, as the project appeared to the Bureau of the Budget, the actual benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.42 to 1, as indicated in the original planning of the project.

The payoff period authorized by Congress for this project is 60 years. However, the Bureau of Reclamation data indicates that the actual period of payout will be 58.7 years or less. Under the terms of Public Law 606 the farmers are obligated to make their payments for the full term of the payout period even though power revenues from the power facilities installed as a part of the project are to be used to assist in financing the irrigation portion of the project after the cost of the power facilities has been liquidated. I should like to point out that according to the Bureau of Reclamation there will be a 66 percent return on the irrigation portion of the project for the entire payout period. This figure compares most favorably with several other projects which are included in the budget; such as the Michaud, which stands at 65 percent; Foster Creek, at 36 percent; Kennewick, at 55 percent. In this respect the Talent project direct benefits figures are not inferior to other approved projects. Financial assistance from the power revenues for the project amounts to 34 percent. This likewise compares favorably to other approved projects.

Construction on the Talent project should go forward at the earliest possible date. The population in Oregon has increased nearly 50 percent in the last 10 years and the rate of increase continues. Because of the exceptionally favorable climatic and living conditions, the Rogue Valley has felt the impact and pressure of this increasing population. The additional water to expand and diversify the industry in southwestern Oregon by expanding the specialized agricultural production is badly needed. I strongly urge that the committee recommend to the Congress the amount of $3 million for construction on the Talent project for the coming fiscal year. I am confident that now that the errors which developed in the project transmittal data to the Bureau of the Budget have been found, both the Budget Bureau and the Bureau of Reclamation will be anxious to have such provision made by the committee. The rapid completion of this project will mean much to the second largest river valley in the State of Oregon.

I may say I think it is quite likely that the Bureau of the Budget, in view of the fact that these errors were called to their attention, may send up a supplemental estimate later in the year. The matter is now under study.

WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION

The budget carries an item in the amount of $300,000 for bank protection and control on the Willamette River. The budget recommendation of $300,000 is essentially similar to what has been provided in appropriations annually for a period of years. This sum is quite inadequate to meet the emergency needs which exist in the area. The Willamette River Basin Commission, an official body of the State of Oregon, has studied this problem in great detail in the past year. The Commission's study resulted in a finding that it is essential that at least $900,000 be made available for bank protection during the coming fiscal year.

I realize that the committee may be puzzled as to why, with the construction of many of these dams and the partial completion of the flood-control system in the Willamette Valley, bank protection should become an increasing problem. There are several factors which are responsible for this fact. First, there is a matter of balance in streamflow and water velocity where uncontrolled waters have a junction point with controlled waters. The uncontrolled waters are able to move more rapidly in the channels than previously. There is an increasing destructive effect upon the channels and the tendency of the rivers to cut across from the uncontrolled to the controlled channel. Further, in the controlled channel, in order to release the accumulated floodwaters, it at times becomes necessary to discharge the waters at near bankfull levels over a long period of time. This likewise has its adverse effect in many sections of the riverbanks.

A third factor, in regard to the necessity for substantially larger sums for bank protection, comes from the fact that a serious maintenance problem has developed in connection with previous expenditures for bank control work. In the Flood Control Act of 1936 the Congress specified that such bank-protection projects built by the Federal Government must be maintained by local interests. However, in 1938 the law was changed and provided that the Federal Government would maintain bank-protection projects previously built and thereafter built. This continued to be the policy of the Federal Government until 1950 when the Congress again required that local interests bear the burden of maintenance on such projects. This maintenance requirement was thus shifted to local parties who did not anticipate and were not organized and had not the financial ability to immediately take care of the problem. In the years since, some of these projects have deteriorated badly and the cost of repair is beyond the capacity of local groups to handle. If it is within the jurisdiction of the committee I believe it wise that provision be made to bring about the repair of these bank-protection projects with proper notice to the local interests that as of a given date the responsibility for maintenance will be theirs. This will give local parties the opportunity to organize themselves to carry the financial burden and to take over the obligation at a time and under circumstances which do not present a prohibitive financial load.

In view of these facts, it is my hope that the committee may carefully review the bank-protection item for the Willamette project and make such additional allowance above the budget recommendation as may be possible.

I think that this matter of changing the basis regarding local participation, as I suggested, might more properly be handled by legislation through the Public Works Committee, although I believe it could be done with some language in your appropriation bill. I would suggest that the committee take a second look at this item in the budget to see if there is some improving language you might be able to incorporate. Perhaps the Army engineers have given some testimony on that subject. If they did not, I suggest that they be interrogated regarding it. It is a very difficult problem, as you can see from the fact a law was changed from 1938 to 1950, and it left the situation very much in difficulty.

HILLS CREEK (FLOOD CONTROL)

The Hills Creek multiple-purpose flood-control dam is located at the junction of Hills Creek and the Willamette River and is a part of the Willamette comprehensive development program. Planning funds were included for the current fiscal year. For the next fiscal year no item is specifically listed in the budget for the completion of planning, but $10,000 is allotted in lump-sum budget recommendations. This planning will be completed early in the first months of the coming fiscal year.

The potential flood damage in this area is now very great. The city of Oakridge which lies below the Hills Creek Dam site has grown very rapidly in the last few years due to the greatly increased lumbering activity in this area. A flood similar to the most serious previously experienced would cause serious damage in Oakridge. The Willamette city area elementary school completed 2 years ago and the $750,000 high school just completed at Westfir would likewise be flooded. Further, it is entirely possible that as many as 100 homes might be lost. The total damage to communities in the area below the dam location from a recurrence of the worst recent flood might easily amount to $3 million. Under the circumstances it is urgent that construction be undertaken on this project at the earliest possible date.

I urge the committee to give every possible consideration to including sufficient funds to enable the Army engineers to proceed with the advertisement of bids for the project and to begin the construction work so that this project can be pushed to an early completion. I am certain that the Army engineers can move ahead quickly on the project if such provision is made. In response to an inquiry by me, the engineers stated that planning and a substantial start on construction can be made in fiscal 1956. It was stated that $2,050,000 can be efficiently expended next year on that project.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration's budget request has included an amount of $2,413,000 for the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon. These funds are required for facilities needed to transmit Columbia River power to the Lower Willamette Valley and the southeast coastal areas of Oregon.

Much of the necessary construction activity in this district is already well underway and the request includes one new major facility. The new facility is a 230-kilovolt transmission line between the J. P. Alvey substation and Reston, and the fund request for that item is $1,352,000 for the line and $112,000 for the Alvey terminal. The Alvey-Reston line is scheduled for completion by December 1957 and, when completed, will in conjunction with the already approved Reston-McKinley facilities provide adequate service for the coastal area where it is very badly needed. Plans for this circuit were developed by the Bonneville Power Administration and the California-Oregon Power Co. and it became a part of the contract agreement between the administration and the company which was made when the overall service plans required in the area were developed.

As already indicated, the balance of the request for this district is for work already underway and includes budget item 132, "Coos Bay

area service," $645,000. The remainder of the request is for normal system additions needed to meet load growth and improved service. Because transmission facilities are urgently needed in this area, I respectfully urge that these funds be appropriated in the full amount of the request.

Bonneville 1956 budget request

100	Major grid:	
123	Upper Willamette Valley service	$59,000
132	Coos Bay area service	645,000
134	Alvey-Reston	
	(*a*) Alvey-Reston line	1,352,000
	(*b*) Alvey terminals	112,000
300	Portland area:	
334	Eugene-Reedsport area service	124,000
339	Springfield substation additions	48,000
341	McKinley-Gold Beach	3,000
399	Other transmission facilities	70,000
	Total	2,413,000

It is not included in the budget this year, but in 1947 it was, and the money was appropriated for it.

CHARLESTON SMALL BOAT BASIN (COOS BAY HARBOR)

As a part of the overall Coos Bay Harbor development, the Congress in 1947 authorized the construction of the Charleston small-boat basin to provide accommodation for the fishing boats and other small craft operating in this area. This project is a meritorious and much needed one. Funds for the construction of this small-boat facility were included in the budget for the fiscal year 1951 and the appropriation was approved by the Congress. However, with the advent of the Korean war and the "no new start" criteria announced by the Truman administration, the funds were impounded and the project has not received budget recommendation of funds since that date. Meantime the makeshift facilities which had been provided had become increasingly worse, the small-boat facilities are such that even the Coast Guard station operating in the area does not have suitable docking facilities for the Government craft.

This project can be undertaken promptly by the Army engineers if funds are made available to them. I wish to urge the committee to include in the civil-functions items an amount of at least $150,000 for the Charleston small-boat basin in the Coos Bay project.

CHETCO RIVER HARBOR, BROOKINGS, OREG.

Just 10 years ago this year Congress authorized a project calling for the construction of small-harbor facilities at the mouth of the Chetco River at Brookings, Oreg. The previous wharfage and water transportation facilities which existed at the Chetco were destroyed in 1936. Over a period of years approximately half a billion board feet of lumber were shipped from the area over the wharf facilities.

The purpose of the presently authorized project is to provide an all-year navigation channel to smaller vessels primarily engaged in offshore fishing with the possibility that further lumber shipments might be made by means of raft into the open waters and loading at sea in the Chetco Cove.

Since the time this project was originally authorized, the lumber industry has greatly expanded its operations in the Brookings area and new plywood production facilities have been installed. The population in the area has more than trebled. There is a substantial tonnage of fish caught in the offshore area. The fishing boat fleet would make use of the small-boat harbor facilities available under this project.

The present estimated cost of this project is $600,000. Local interests will furnish free of cost to the United States necessary land easements and rights-of-way and spoil-disposal areas for the project. I trust that the committee will investigate the Chetco project carefully and find it possible to include funds for planning and the beginning of construction of this new harbor facility.

ROGUE RIVER HARBOR, GOLD BEACH, OREG.

The Rogue River, draining the second largest river basin in the State of Oregon, empties into the Pacific at Gold Beach, Oreg., the county seat of Curry County. This county, while possessing excellent resources in minerals and timber and having fine agricultural lands and recreational facilities, has been handicapped in development by reason of no railroad transportation, no harbor facilities, and limited highway facilities. Despite these handicapes the population of Curry County has been increasing rapidly in the last few years. Lumbering activities have expanded and new plywood and other wood-utilization plants are being constructed in the county.

After a long and careful study of the resources of the county, its population, its industries and commerce and future potential, the Army engineers recommended and the Congress authorized the construction of a harbor at the mouth of the Rogue River to be known as Gold Beach Harbor. The estimated cost of the project approved by the Congress is $3,758,000.

The growth of the lumber industry in Curry County has been slow and discouraging because of the long haul by truck which was necessary either north to railroads or south to cities in California. In the area immediately tributary to Gold Beach are timber reserves in excess of 4 billion feet in a variety of species which enjoy a high demand in the lumber market. Minerals in the area are coal, copper, chromium, and some quicksilver, though development of these resources has been delayed because of transportation limitations. A substantial fishing industry could be established were there adequate port facilities for fishing fleets which operate in the offcoast area.

No provision is made in the budget for undertaking the construction of the Gold Beach project. I trust the committee may examine this authorized project and recommend to the Congress funds for planning and for beginning of construction or for both in the committee recommendation to the House.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION FUNDS (RIVERS AND HARBORS INSTALLATIONS)

The budget recommendation carries funds for the normal annual maintenance and operation costs of the river and harbor projects at the

port of Bandon, at the port of Umpqua and Reedsport and at the Coos Bay Harbor at Coos Bay. I urge upon the committee the concurrence in the budget recommendation for these items to maintain these port and harbor facilities in useful condition.

AMAZON CREEK (FLOOD CONTROL)

The Amazon Creek flood-control project is a part of the Willamette Basin flood-control system. Amazon Creek arises in the foothills of the drainage basin in which Eugene is located and flows through the city and ultimately reaches the Willamette by way of the Long Tom River. Because of the peculiar topography, the city of Eugene is inundated by several flash floods annually.

The preliminary flood protection provided in the original authorization of the project has been completed and the pending request will bring the full protection necessary in the area. The total cost is approximately $1 million of which the local sponsors will contribute $339,000.

While the budget recommendation does not make provision for construction and only advanced planning funds are included in the budget, I should like to point out that this project has reached a point where the construction funds to complete this project could be used within the fiscal year if made available by appropriations. The planning funds could be applied very early in the fiscal year and the beginning of construction follow closely thereafter. The project is a meritorious one for which provision of construction funds should be made and should be completed at the earliest possible date.

LOOKOUT POINT DAM (FLOOD CONTROL MULTIPLE-PURPOSE)

The Lookout Point multiple-purpose dam on the middle fork of the Willamette River is rapidly reaching the point of completion. The budget estimate for 1956 is $1,400,000. This dam along with the Dexter reregulating dam just below the Lookout Point and which is considered a part of the Lookout Point project is being dedicated in the near future and, under the funds recommended by the budget, the project is scheduled for completion during the coming fiscal year. The project will develop approximately 130,000 kilowatts of power.

DETROIT DAM (FLOOD CONTROL MULTIPLE-PURPOSE)

The Detroit Dam project is essentially complete except for the remaining work to be done on the Big Cliff reregulating dam located a short distance below the Detroit Dam. The budget estimate for this purpose is $797,000. There will be approximately 118,000 kilowatts of power available from the project and irrigation waters from the project will be used in Stayton and in Salem, Oreg.

HARBOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Authorized as parts of major harbor projects but not listed for funds in the budget are the Smith River, Winchester Bay, and Scofield River projects on the Umpqua and the Coos and Millicoma River improvements on the Coos River. Each of these smaller projects has

been authorized for a period of years and improvements are such as to contribute greatly to increased utilization of the ports with which these facilities are connected. I desire to call particular attention of the committee to the projects and trust that the committee will find itself warranted in recommending appropriations which will bring about these improvements as promptly as possible.

You gentlemen have been very patient in hearing my testimony.

I have one further item to mention to you. I believe this has been brought to your attention before, but the harbor of the Columbia River, the mouth of the Columbia River, is badly in need of funds for deepening. I think testimony has come before your committee on that subject. I am sure the committee has been told that the situation at the mouth of the Columbia now is getting bad; that the depth of the water there is less than it was 30 years ago. In the meantime the city of Portland has doubled in population. Shipping has been maintained at a high rate. It is the most important port in Oregon and the project which has been approved and authorized is very, very badly needed indeed for the economy of the State of Oregon and the city of Portland.

That concludes my testimony. Does the committee have any questions?

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Congressman Ellsworth. I might state that I have listened with interest to your testimony. It is certainly full and complete and evidences the much study you have given to the various projects underway, and those proposed for the district of the State that you most ably represent.

It is evident that you have gone into great detail and study, and we thank you for providing the committee with helpful information.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. We have had much testimony about the various projects that you have mentioned. Some of these projects do not have budget approval. A number of the items you mentioned have budget approval.

The Talent division has had much testimony. Is it your view that a minimum of $3 million should be approved by this committee to start this important work in the next fiscal year?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes, I believe that that money could be efficiently used. However, I am told informally that the Bureau of Reclamation has indicated that an appropriation of $2,500,000 would effectively start the project. As I pointed out in my testimony, the Talent project is vital to the economy of Oregon. It is in a very large river basin. It is a very fertile area. It produces noncompetitive crops, but crops for which there is an abundant market. The project has been under study for over 10 years, and there is no question in the minds of the people there, and in my own mind, that it is a sound pay-out project. I anticipate budget approval even during this year. It would be most helpful to the project if this committee could likewise anticipate budget approval and incorporate in the bill the money for a new start on that reclamation and irrigation project.

Mr. EVINS. You talked about deepening and dredging the Columbia River Harbor. How bad is the situation out in your area now in that regard, and how much work needs to be done and how much in funds do you think should be provided for this work if it is approved?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That project is about 75 miles north of my district. I am not intimately acquainted with the facts of the project. I understand that the total cost is around $8 million. Whether or not that could all be expended in 1 fiscal year I do not know, but my recommendation is that whatever amount can be expended efficiently during the coming fiscal year really should be appropriated for the economy of the area and the whole Pacific coast.

I may say that there is an important defense angle in that harbor because it is a large and deep harbor, which during World War II and World War I handled a vast amount of shipping for war purposes.

Mr. EVINS. We thank you, Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

IRRIGATION AND POWER IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

WITNESS

HON. DON MAGNUSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be pleased to hear our friend and colleague the very able Congressman from Washington, Don Magnuson.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are a number of items in the budget for fiscal year 1956 which are of great importance to the State of Washington, which I represent as Congressman at large. Our State is one of the most rapidly growing in the Nation. One of our greatest resources is water, water which can be diverted to irrigate hundreds of thousands of acres of arid land, water which can be utilized as it flows to the sea to produce the electric energy which is so necessary to satisfy the growing needs of both industrial and individual consumers.

The projects in the budget, both under construction and proposed, will help to turn this potential resource to productive use.

The Columbia Basin project will deliver water, when the initial phase is completed to 624,000 acres of fertile land in the heart of the State of Washington. At this time, facilities have been completed to deliver water to approximately 186,000 acres, roughly one-third of the goal.

Each year since water first started to flow, between 50,000 and 60,000 acres have been added to the system. The schedule for fiscal 1956 calls for 54,000 acres. The amount requested in the budget is to permit orderly completion of the facilities to serve these 54,000 acres and to place contracts for a portion of the 1957 laterals.

The budget request is for $12½ million. So far as I know, it is adequate to meet the program for the coming fiscal year.

I cannot stress too much the importance of proceeding with orderly and scheduled development of the program. Many other activities depend on maintenance of the schedule. Local governments have laid careful plans for construction of schools, roads, and public facilities; the many new businesses which have come into the area are dependent on the rate of development continuing as planned.

The Foster Creek Division of the Chief Joseph Dam project was authorized by Public Law 540 of the 83d Congress, 2d session. It is a new project which will provide a full water supply for approxi-

mately 4,500 acres and supplemental water for an additional 1,130 acres of land. It is made possible by the construction of Chief Joseph Dam on the Columbia River, which raises the surface of the river to a point where it is feasible to pump water to the fertile lands nearby. Total estimated cost is $4,798,000, of which $631,000 is requested for fiscal year 1956.

The project will serve some of the finest fruit lands in the State. The budgeted amount will permit construction to begin this coming year.

The Kennewick Division is the sixth and last division of the Yakima project. When completed, it will bring water to about 19,000 acres of land along the lower Yakima River in the State of Washington.

As of June 1955, it is expected this division will be 70 percent complete. The $3 million requested for fiscal 1956 will permit completion of the major parts of the project. Almost all of the funds requested will be used to make progress payments on work under construction, including irrigation canals and wasteways, laterals, and pumping plants.

I fully support the appropriation request for the Kennewick Division. As Congressman at large, I share the interest of the local residents in the orderly completion of the project.

At another place in the record of these hearings I have inserted a full statement expressing my support of the $75,000 requested for the Roza Division and, in addition, asking that funds be made available to begin construction of the powerplant called for in the original plans. The powerplant is the only major item of the project which has not been completed.

Funds are requested in the budget for continuation of the work on three large, multipurpose dams on the Columbia River—Chief Joseph, McNary, and the Dalles.

When completed, these 3 great dams will add 3,096,000 kilowatts of power capacity to the power supply of the Northwest.

The stark fact of the power picture in the Northwest, however, is that even this sizable block of power will not be sufficient to meet the foreseeable demand. It is highly important that progress on these dams continue as scheduled, while plans are made to bring even additional power on the line in the critical period ahead.

The amount requested for McNary Dam is $11 million. This money principally will be used to continue construction of the powerhouse and complete the installation of power generating units 9, 10, 11, and 12. Fourteen units in all are planned for the initial phase of the project.

Sixty-three million five hundred thousand dollars is requested for the Dalles Dam. This project is in the early stages of construction. The funds requested are necessary to keep the construction work on schedule. It is significant that the closure dam can be placed only during the low water period, and placing of the dam is scheduled to begin in October 1956. All of the work programed for fiscal 1956 must be completed before the closure dam can be placed. A delay in any part will postpone the placing of power on the line about 8 months, a delay which might well be critical in view of the potential shortage of power expected at that time.

It is estimated that the Chief Joseph Dam project is 61 percent complete. The work has progressed to the point where power will become

available. The funds requested in the amount of $18 million for fiscal year 1956 are necessary to meet the present schedule for power production, which provides for the first 3 64,000 kilowatt units to be on the line in September of this year and each of the remaining 13 units to be put into production at 3-month intervals.

I strongly support the budget requests for these 3 highly important projects on the Columbia River.

The fund request of the Bonneville Power Administration for the State of Washington amounts to $13,206,000. These funds are necessary for the construction of facilities which already have been approved and for the construction of new facilities needed to meet the increased load requirements of the State and the generation schedules of projects which are placing new power on the line.

Major grid activity is continuing on lines from Chief Joseph Dam toward the general Seattle area and from the Dalles and McNary Dams to the major western load areas. The power which these dams will produce cannot be utilized without the completion of the transmission grids to bring the power to the potential consumers. The rapid load growths in various parts of the State also require the construction of new substation facilities and the expansion of existing facilities.

Operation and maintenance funds for the Bonneville system in the amount of $6,650,000 also are requested in the budget. Of the many thousands of miles of transmission lines built by the Bonneville Power Administration and of the large-capacity substations built by this agency, well over one-half are in the State of Washington. Many of these lines traverse very rugged country, and are subject to extreme conditions of weather. The Federal Government has a very large investment in these facilities. I believe that the funds requested are necessary to operate and maintain this complicated system to do the job it is built to do.

Bonneville Power Administration

WITNESS

HON. GRACIE PFOST, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. Evins. The committee will be pleased to hear the statement of Congresswoman Gracie Pfost.

Mrs. Pfost. Mr. Chairman, my name is Gracie Pfost. I am a Member of Congress from Idaho.

The fund request of the Bonneville Power Administration for the First Congressional District of Idaho, is in the amount of $29,000 for fiscal year 1956. This figure is quite small in comparison with the overall request of that agency.

I wish to advise the committee that I fully support the request for these funds. I understand they are needed to finish up work which is pretty well completed in that area.

Scale Model of San Francisco Bay

WITNESS

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Evins. The committee has before it today Congressman John F. Shelley and we will be pleased to hear his statement.

Mr. Shelley. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I want to thank you for giving me opportunity to support an adequate appropriation for the Corps of Engineers to complete construction of a scale model of San Francisco Bay within the next fiscal year. An appropriation of $50,000 was voted last year to initiate the project and the plans are now well underway, as I am sure you gentlemen are aware.

The Bureau of the Budget has approved a request for $250,000 for fiscal 1956 for actual construction work on the model of the bay to be built on land already owned by the Corps of Engineers at Sausalito, Calif., across the Golden Gate from San Francisco. It is estimated that a total of $500,000 will be required to complete construction of this large-scale model. When completed the model will serve as the basis of an overall survey of the San Francisco Bay and its surrounding area looking toward a comprehensive plan for full economic development of the bay area, its port, and navigation facilities, and primarily toward conservation and control of the water and other resources available which are not now utilized to the best advantage. A total of $2,500,000 has already been authorized for the comprehensive study.

The budget request of this year for $250,000 contemplates stretching construction of the scale model over a period of 2 years. Until this model is completed the study to follow cannot make any real progress. I am advised that if the entire $500,000 cost of the model were to be appropriated for fiscal 1956 the model construction could be speeded up to the point where it could be finished within the fiscal year. This project has been in the mill for many years now and in the meantime a great many controversies and plans looking toward the development of the bay area; its water resources; its navigation and port facilities; its security against potential attack; and its general economic future have been unresolved or held in abeyance. Further, the State of California is currently engaging in a study of this problem which, by both State and Federal legislation, is intended to be coordinated with the comprehensive study to be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers. Another year of delay in the building of the bay model will set the whole program back just that much further. Because of the importance of this vital project to San Francisco, the bay area, the State, and to the national welfare as well I urge the subcommittee most strongly to increase the appropriation for the coming fiscal year to the full $500,000 needed to finish the model.

The Water Project Authority of the State of California has just submitted to the State Legislature a comprehensive report on the feasibility of certain features of the problem of proper utilization of the fresh water resources now wasting through the bay and the prevention of salt water contamination of irrigated lands in the inland

areas nearby. It is imperative that the Corps of Engineers study be completed within the shortest possible time lest plans formulated in the State without the more adequate information which will be developed by the Engineers' study are carried to the point where much work will have to be undone in order to bring the State plans and engineers' recommendations into conformity. Money spent for that purpose now can result in great savings later as the over all development program matures.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your subcommittee's indulgence in this problem. I will be grateful for the sober consideration I know that you will give this request and I urge strongly that a $500,000 appropriation for the San Francisco Bay model be included in your final recommendations.

Shilshole Bay Breakwater

WITNESS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. Evins. The committee will now hear from Congressman Pelly, of the State of Washington. Mr. Pelly, you may proceed with your statement.

Mr. Pelly. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of adequate planning funds for the Corps of Engineers so that it can proceed on plans for the Shilshole Bay breakwater, an authorized project on the east shore of Puget Sound at Seattle, Wash.

Immediate planning for this 4200 breakwater, north of the entrance to the Lake Washington Ship Canal is of the utmost importance. I am confident the Corps recognizes this and will give a high priority to this project from such planning funds as are allowed.

In support of adequate funds so planning can commence on the Shilshole breakwater, and emphasizing its critical need, I refer you to the record which shows the current benefit-cost ratio of 2.06. The situation is that this breakwater when constructed will provide an anchorage for commercial fishing vessels and other craft with high masts which will reduce traffic congestion in the canal and cut down on the delays to vehicular traffic caused by the raising of 4 main drawbridges which carry 200,000 persons each day and are the only means of north and south travel because the canal, so to speak, cuts the city in two.

In 1952, these four bridges opened and closed 17,921 times. The Lake Washington Ship Canal is the busiest canal in the United States and the hours when Government vessels can pass through it have had to be restricted. As a result, the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and merchant marine installations on the canal are inconvenienced with costly delays.

This situation will be corrected by allowing small craft to remain outside the canal entrance protected from rough seas. Each and every requirement for local participation has been satisfied during the 27 years this breakwater has been under consideration.

Now the people of Seattle urgently hope the Corps of Engineers can proceed with detailed plans and specifications. Therefore, my

testimony today is in behalf of no reduction in money for planning requested by the Corps.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1955.

MARINA PLAYA DEL REY PROJECT, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIF.

WITNESSES

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
REX THOMSON, DIRECTOR OF HARBORS AND MARINA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. EVINS. We will be more than pleased to hear from our colleague, the Hon. Gordon L. McDonough and Hon. James Roosevelt, of California, who, I understand, are interested in the Playa del Rey project.

Mr. McDonough, I understand you wish to speak first. You may be as persuasive as you desire. We are delighted to see you and to hear you. You are one of our able Congressmen, a fine personality, and the gentlemen of the Committee will be glad to hear you.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to ask the committee that I have the privilege to revise and extend my remarks.

I brought no prepared copy with me, but to review the situation on this particular project briefly, I introduced a bill in the last Congress which authorized the construction of the Marina Playa Del Rey in California.

It is an inland basin in an area of low land, just off the Santa Monica coastline. Although I am vitally interested in the project, as an addition to our inland basin navigable water system along the coastline, the project is actually located in Mr. Roosevelt's district. However, the immediate country adjacent to it is in my district, and the other congressional districts of the county, and even beyond that.

The county of Los Angeles has taken a very great interest in this project to the extent of acquiring rights-of-way, land, and providing means for removing any obstacles that may impede progress on the construction of it.

The State of California has, by legislative action, appropriated some $2 million for the project.

There are many, many features of this project that I think this committee will find different from the average project that you will hear testimony on. For one reason the cost ratio is about 12½ percent Federal cost compared to 87½ percent local cost.

I do not want to take up the time of the committee by going into detail.

I am sure that Mr. Roosevelt has some pertinent remarks to make concerning it, and then I would like to introduce Mr. Rex Thomson, who is Los Angeles County harbor director.

For the information of the committee, under the harbor setup in the State of California, we have, by State law, the right to set up a

State harbor, a city harbor, or a county harbor. We have the large Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor. That is a municipal harbor. The harbor in San Francisco is a State harbor.

Under the charter of the State of California we can set up county harbors, and this is the first time that Los Angeles has gone into the harbor business under its rights under the constitution. I am certain that once this project is put into operation that it will be not only a great asset to southern California commercially, but that it will remove an unsightly area in Los Angeles County.

I also have a letter here addressed to the chairman of your whole committee, signed by the Governor of the State of California. For the purpose of the record, and for the benefit of the committee I will read the letter. The Governor addresses Mr. Cannon and says:

I am pleased to take this opportunity to urge that your committee give serious and favorable consideration to legislation appropriating Federal funds for the Marina Playa del Rey project.

As you are no doubt aware, the State of California already has appropriated $2 million for this project.

It is my firm belief that the establishment of a small-craft harbor at Playa del Rey would have a beneficial effect on the economy of that area. This would be accomplished by the creation of a large labor market during the construction period and a continuing need for service employees during the lifetime of the harbor.

It likewise would have a most stimulating effect upon the small-craft industry, and most important of all, would serve as a recreational area without parallel on our west coast.

Cordially.

That is signed by Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of the State of California.

That is a definite assurance that the State is interested in this project not only morally, but financially, to the extent of some $2 million.

I appreciate the consideration of the committee in setting this time apart to hear us on this project, and I am sure that the virtues of the project are worth considering from many points of view, and I trust that the committee will give favorable consideration to it.

Mr. Chairman, the participation of the Federal Government in the construction of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, located at Venice, Calif., was authorized by Public Law 780, 83d Congress, 2d session. Section 101 of the law states—

Federal participation in the provision of entrance jetties, entrance channel, interior channel and central basin recommended in the project report and presently estimated to cost $7,738,000 shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

The Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor project is a cooperative flood control, beach erosion, small-boat harbor and recreational area in which Los Angeles City, Los Angeles County, the State of California, and the Federal Government are participating. The California State Legislature has already authorized $2 million for the project, and at this time it is requested that funds be appropriated for the Federal Government's share in this project as authorized by Public Law 780. This is in the amount of approximately $3,500,000.

The Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor project is vitally important to the people of Los Angeles. It will give them a new marine, beach, and small-boat recreation area. And at the same time it will remove

a blighted, nonproductive, mosquito-infested swamp hole, and transform it into a thriving commercial and industrial center which has been estimated should create a noncompetitive market for labor and materials in excess of $12 million annually.

The project will provide a harbor for the United States Coast Guard for air-sea rescue on Santa Monica Bay, a very important factor since Los Angeles International Airport is located but some 1½ miles from this proposed harbor development. The airport serves 1 of the 3 heaviest burdens of air traffic experienced in the United States, and is so situated that some 80 percent of its traffic must, of necessity, become airborne by utilizing the seaward extensions of its runways, and the United States Coast Guard has been disturbed for some time because there exists no site between San Pedro Bay and Santa Barbara which will permit the Coast Guard to base a general search and rescue unit to protect not only the surface craft utilizing such coastal waters but particularly to protect air traffic from International Airport whose critical flight period is during that interval when the plane leaves the runway and attempts while over the ocean to gain its cruising altitude.

In considering the future use of this project, it appears reasonable to assume that in a condition of national emergency, the existence of this inland harbor would provide a valuable asset to either our military or civil operations since it would not only provide a standby harbor capable of berthing medium-draft vessels (10- to 20-foot depths at lower low water), but a harbor located on the focal termini of our freeway system so truck transportation may be utilized, and also located on the permanent remaining main freight lines of the Pacific Electric system, thus immediately available to all rail transport.

The Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor project would, of course, also provide a small-boat harbor for public use, and would open up a new area of coastal waters for general use.

Furthermore, the harbor project would greatly facilitate the remedy for an increasingly grievous local drainage problem. This area, at the present time, takes the runoff from the Santa Monica Mountains area affecting some 1,800 acres in the Ballona Creek area, and also several thousand additional acres that are developed or semideveloped.

Total cost for the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor has been estimated at approximately $25 million, and, except for such Federal funds as are appropriated for this project which will be only a small part of the total, the cost will be borne by the State of California and the county and city of Los Angeles.

I feel that in view of all the facts, the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor is an important project that should be constructed and completed as soon as possible. The local government has already purchased much of the land necessary for the site. The work on the channel entrance should be started, and this is the purpose of the Federal appropriation which is now requested. I sincerely urge the favorable consideration of this request by this committee.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. McDonough, for your very fine statement. At this point we will insert into the record the general statement of Mr. Rex Thomson.

(The statement referred to follows:)

THE IMPROVEMENT OF PLAYA DEL REY INLET AND BASIN (A PROJECT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SMALL-CRAFT HARBOR), AUTHORIZED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, our county, supported by both the State of California and the city of Los Angeles, is sincerely desirous of establishing new markets for material and labor, thus implementing our regional economy, and in turn our national economy; and, in this instance by the appropriate utilization of our coastal waters, whose inexhaustible attractions have as yet been but meagerly exploited due to a shortage of harbor facilities for small craft which prohbits the latter's existence to any degree commensurate with our population.

This coastal county possesses no natural harbors, and its two man-made harbors, being limited in area, cannot afford to sacrifice the valuable space that would be required to accommodate any reasonable quotas of small craft.

In fact, our actual registration of such small craft is less than one-fifth of those quotas as experienced by the other coastal communities of our State who have sufficient harbor accommodations available. For example:

Small craft [1] per thousand population

San Francisco and Marin Counties	5.0
Santa Barbara County	5.5
San Joaquin County	4.4
San Diego County	8.0
Orange County (Newport)	16.5
Los Angeles County	1.2

[1] By the designation "small craft," we refer only to commercial and semicommercial sports craft and to privately operated pleasure craft.

In other words, if normal harbor facilities were available here for small craft, we could expect 45,000 to be regionally owned and operated as opposed to the 5,000 now utilizing all the existing facilities available to them in our local harbors.

Therefore, it appears obvious that our local economy is denied those beneficial, permanent, and substantial markets for labor and materials which an increased traffic and commerce in small craft would demand and support, were the expected normal quotas permitted by the creation of such adequate harbor accommodations as are now nonexistent.

Therefore, the county of Los Angeles does urgently and respectully request your favorable consideration of an appropriation, to the end that we may develop such small-craft harbor as recently authorized by the 83d Congress.

This harbor would also provide the Coast Guard with a very much needed and long-desired site at which to base a general search and rescue unit, not only for the protection of surface craft, but particularly for the protection of one of our Nation's heaviest quotas of airborne traffic, of which 85 percent in departing from our International Airport must experience their critical flight period by gaining cruising altitude over the open ocean, and for such other purposes necessary to the Coast Guard in an instance of national emergency, since this proposed development will provide the one and only harbor on our county's western shoreline.

The Legislature of the State of California has appropriated $2 million for purchase of this harbor site under the conditoins that said harbor be developed by the county with the cooperation of the Federal Government and that the county furthermore take the responsibilities for its maintenance and operation.

May I here respectfully call your attention that the board of supervisors did in 1950 formally commit the county to certain following actions subsequent to Federal approval, to wit: the acquisition of necessary lands, including adequate entrance channel and further, to also provide those secondary developments and improvements that would be deemed necessary to make said interior berthing basins complete, i. e., roads, sewers, light, power, water, parking, etc., to the end that they adequately attract, protect, and service small craft and its attendant industries.

We would like to emphasize that as a result of our above-specified commitments and in accord with the recent recommendations emanating from the Federal Bureau of the Budget, that Federal funds are only expected to provide approximately 12½ of the total cost of the development, the provision of the balance becoming the responsibility of local interests.

To date this proposed development has, in addition to the recommendations of the Federal agencies involved, been studied and formally approved by all those State, county, municipal, and those civic, industrial, commercial, and labor organizations who are delegated to or responsible for an interest in such an improvement, since the effects and benefits of said improvement are here accepted to be regional rather than local in nature.

Therefore, that we may properly implement our regional economy by the utilization of our coastal waters, we sincerely request you take favorable action in providing a Federal appropriation which will permit the actual construction of this harbor to be undertaken without delay; thus providing a condition which will create a new market for labor and materials, estimated to exceed $12 million annually—that this new market become a reality at the earliest possible date.

ITEMIZATION OF ATTENDANT ASSETS

1. Revitalization of small craft and attendant industries.
2. Provide base for United States Coast Guard general search and rescue unit.
3. Make available for Navy use such new haul-out and repair facilities and new sources of craftsmen experienced in ship's maintenance and repair.
4. Make largest of important sports fishing grounds, now denied them, readily available to commercial fleet.
5. Relieve existing commercial harbors of congestion now imposed by the presence of existing small craft.
6. Construction would give employment to our numerous dredges and quarries, who are now approaching a state of idleness.

Would you tell the committee how much money you are requesting be placed in the budget because the item, as I understand it, has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The estimate of the Army engineers, and the only participation that the Federal Government is requested to take part in on the project, is the building of the channel to break the coastline in order to make a navigable entrance to the inland basin. Mr. Thomson will give you more of the detail on that. The Army engineers have estimated that the channel is $7 million plus. The Army engineers say the Federal Government should supply 50 percent of that cost, which is around $3 million plus.

Mr. EVINS. The county of Los Angeles, you feel, would be willing to participate in it up to 50 percent of the cost?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes; of the channel cost.

Mr. EVINS. Of the channel cost?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes; after the channel is built; that is, the entrance from the coastline. There will be 117 acres of navigable water in the harbor, or inland basin, which will be constructed without any cost to the Federal Government at all.

Mr. EVINS. This is a small-craft harbor facility?

Mr. McDONOUGH. It will be a small-craft harbor which will not only supply a harbor for commercial fishing, but also a Coast Guard harbor in the area. We do not have any Coast Guard harbor in that particular area of the coast at the present time.

Mr. EVINS. Is this an auxiliary to existing harbors in the area?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Oh, definitely, yes.

The history of this coastline, as far as harbors are concerned, for small craft goes back some 50 years.

There was a great political fight here in the Congress many years ago on deciding where the Los Angeles Harbor should be located, whether it should be located off Santa Monica or at San Pedro. Senator Stephen M. White represented the State of California in the Senate at that time and finally won his fight that San Pedro should be the location of the Los Angeles Harbor.

The coastline is a crescent [indicating] with another slight crescent here [indicating]. San Pedro is around that point [indicating]. This harbor is around this area on this crescent on the Santa Monica coastline.

An attempt was made to build a harbor at Santa Monica for small craft, and the littoral action of the ocean broke down every attempt that they made to build a satisfactory small-boat harbor in that location.

This is a protected coastline area and it has been found from all of the analyses by the experts that this is an ideal place for the harbor, the prevailing winds, the action of the ocean against the shore, and many other things that they have analyzed entered into the finding that it is a favorable location for the harbor.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. McDonough, in your opinion, how much money could be properly used in the next fiscal year for advance planning and probably some construction?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Well, for advance planning and some construction I would say that we could use $1,500,000 very easily. I know that the designing, plans and specifications and construction will take some time, but I know that they could start some worthwhile work on that project in no time at all.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, Mr. McDonough.

Mr. HAND. What is the proposal here, Congressman, is it build the typical stone jetties?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Yes; it is a regular stone jetty entrance to the harbor, and as to the dimensions of it, Mr. Thomson can give you more detail on the depth and width of it.

Mr. HAND. There are no jetties there at all at the present time?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. No, sir; there are no jetties there at the present time. The only outlet is for our flood-control runoff from the Santa Monica Mountains about 12 miles to the north.

Mr. HAND. And the harbor area would comprise some 117 acres; is that your statement?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Yes; there will be about 117 acres of navigable harbor, with wharfs and places for harboring boats.

Mr. HAND. Is that a natural harbor now?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I would say that it is. I think it was part of the ocean shoreline at one time, and it was cut off by a sand dune that was built up there. This was formerly a part of the ocean.

Mr. EVINS. And it has some natural protection, regardless of the construction of the stone jetty?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Yes; and, as a matter of fact, the portion that we are talking about dredging is now very low. It has been drilled for oil. There are a lot of old oil wells in that have gone dry. It is a sump hole. As a matter of fact, when the heavy rains come there it fills up to a point where it is nothing but a swamp. The land back of it is high enough to protect it.

Mr. HAND. There is no navigable depth there now at all; is there?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. No, sir; not at all.

Mr. HAND. Your State and local authorities would undertake all of the necessary dredging?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Yes; all of the dredging of the inside channel is a local responsibility.

Mr. HAND. To what depth do you contemplate dredging the inner harbor?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Thomson, what is the depth of the basin?

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Thomson, would you give yur full name and the organization that you represent for the record?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes; gladly. My name is Rex Thomson. I am director of the Department of Harbors and Marine for the County of Los Angeles, and I am here by order of the board of supervisors for that county.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I will withhold any further questions I have have until after Mr. Thomson's testimony because I do not want to interfere with his or Mr. Roosevelt's testimony.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be pleased to hear from our colleague and friend, Mr. Roosevelt, of California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to come before you and discuss the Marina Playa Del Rey project. May I first say that I am very appreciative of my colleague, Mr. McDonough, coming over here in support of this project. He has been familiar with the project for years, and as he has well stated, it was his bill which brought about the authority originally to commence the planning of the work on this project.

I would like to point out to the committee that this particular harbor is not just a recreational harbor, and that it has, I think, many other desirable attributes.

Perhaps the best way to illustrate this is for me to distribute these maps to you. These are in sets of three, and I think you will be able to see from these maps, No. 1, the general area, No. 2, the specific project itself, and No. 3, the fact that this is a much-needed improvement because of the lack of other similar facilities throughout this whole coastline.

If you will notice, particularly on the map showing the site for the proposed harbor, you will note that the international airport lines at a very close distance to the proposed harbor. For many months, if not for years, there has been a tremendous hazard existing in that international airport, inasmuch as nearly all of the flights that take off from the airport take off right straight out over the ocean, and there is no air-sea rescue unit within a very considerable distance of this around in the Los Angeles Harbor area. As a result of that situation, the hazard to life is considerable, and I think the Coast Guard—in fact, I know that the Coast Guard, and all other interested parties are very hopeful that we will be able to establish such an air-sea rescue unit at this spot in the near future.

The fact that we have not actually had an accident with heavy loss of life there, I think, is an act of providence, and certainly should not be taken as a reason for not establishing such a unit here.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. If you will yield at that point, Mr. Roosevelt, I asked for the record of the planes that have fallen in that area which did not have any assistance at the time they fell. There are quite a number of aircraft which have fallen there without aid from any shoreline facility to assist them, where an air-sea rescue unit of the United States Coast Guard would have been a great help. I can supply that for the record if it would be helpful.

Mr. EVINS. Yes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think that would be a good idea.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. The following letter to California Governor Goodwin Knight, from the Los Angeles International Aircraft Fire and Safety Committee, reveals the urgent need for an air-sea rescue unit in the Santa Monica Bay area, followed by a list of air accidents which have occurred in this area.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

MARCH 17, 1955.

Hon. GOODWIN J. KNIGHT,
Governor of California,
State Capitol, Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR KNIGHT: The Airport Fire and Safety Committee of the Los Angeles International Airport, made up of representatives of all of the operating companies, concerns itself with matters pertinent to safety.

For the past several years adequate protection in the Santa Monica area in the event it becomes necessary to "ditch" an aircraft has become a grave concern to all interested parties.

In the calendar year 1953, there were 138,738 air transport movements at Los Angeles International Airport and during the same year 2,507,552 passengers were handled through this same terminal.

Within the Santa Monica Basin, the following airports are located, concerned with a vast military production of aircraft:

Approximate air-miles to ocean

	Air-miles
Long Beach: Douglas Aircraft	4
Hughes Field: Hughes Aircraft	1½
Clover Field: Douglas Aircraft	1¾
Northrop Field: Northrop Aircraft	5
Lockheed Air Terminal: Lockheed	12
Los Angeles International Airport: Douglas and North American Aviation	1½
San Fernando Valley Airport: Lockheed final assembly and California Air National Guard	9

It has been estimated by the Aircraft Industry Association, under release dated October 6, 1953, that approximately $3 million per day are being brought in the Los Angeles area cash registers through the payrolls of the 6 major aircraft manufacturers in this metropolitan district.

The development of air sea rescue in the Santa Monica Bay area could best be accomplished with the establishment of the Marina Yacht Basin, in that it would provide refuge for surface craft for the United States Coast Guard when placing rescue equipment in this area.

In view of the fact that Los Angeles International Airport is the fourth busiest domestic terminal in the United States and a great percentage of our takeoffs are over the bay area, plus the testing from the aircraft factories over designated areas, together with a great amount of flying in the immediate vicinity, the establishment of the Marina Yacht Basin would render a great service to the State of California and the aviation industry.

Respectfully,

ALEX LUNDELL, *Chairman.*

The following is a list of Santa Monica Bay area accidents occurring from 1947 to the present:

(1) November 4, 1947 at 1205: An Aeronca crash landed 150 yards off the end of Avenue C in Redondo Beach. The aircraft, with two occupants, left Gardena Airport and crossed the coast line when an emergency landing became necessary. The passengers climbed to the top of the aircraft after impact with the water, but were not rescued.

(2) May 5, 1948, at 0859: An Ercoupe made a forced landing in the water off Venice after broadcasting "May Day" due to engine failure. The pilot was lost.

(3) September 5, 1948 at 1730: An Aeronca from Grand Central Airport crashed into Santa Monica Bay. One fatality.

(4) February 4, 1949, at 1050: A North American X–AJ–1. Two fatalities.

(5) June 28, 1949 at 1827: A BT13 crashed off Bluff Point at Palos Verdes. Two fatalities resulted.

(6) September 23, 1952 at 0305: 600 yards off Manhattan Beach pier an Ercoupe, out of Northrop Field at Hawthorne, crashed resulting in two fatalities.

(7) May 9, 1953 at 1720: An F–86D from Los Angeles International Airport. The pilot bailed out and landed in the water but was lost. In this case, the first rescue vessels appeared on the scene 1.5 hours after the first call for assistance.

Prior to 1947, accidents occurred to both military and civil aircraft. Though airline operation was not extensive from this facility prior to 1947, the loss of personnel and aircraft through military and civil operators represents an intangible in technical experience and dollars.

The above listed accidents represent a total of 11 fatalities. You will also note that none of these occurred on the takeoff phase of flight with the exception of the F–86D which was climbing after takeoff.

In view of the traffic generated in this southern California area and based on the statistical evidence concerning this flight phase and accident frequency, it is apparent that such an accident is a predictable probability, if not a certainty. Since the nearest surface rescue facilities are 40 minutes away, the potential loss of life from drowning in a ditching accident involving a large commercial transport can easily exceed the total loss of life in the 7 accidents involving water crashes since 1947.

Our purpose is to provide the necessary protection for this eventuality on the same basis that a fire station is located in an expanding community, that is, action based on protection of the houses from potential loss as opposed to the mere tally of losses thus far.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There has been no major disaster there, but, as Mr. McDonough has well pointed out, there have been a number of accidents, smaller disasters.

Secondly, I think it is fairly obvious that this has been a depressed area and that the installation of this facility here would not only revive the entire area, but would constitute, I think, a tremendous help to the labor situation. It would create skills which are badly needed by both the Navy and the general maritime industry.

It would also, of course, provide very much needed access, as Mr. McDonough has so well pointed out, not only to his district, but to all of the surrounding district, and it would relieve the situation which has become very serious in the major commercial harbors.

Today, for instance, much of the small boat recreational work is done in the commercial harbors of Los Angeles and San Pedro, and as a result those harbors have had created in them a considerable hazard for the commercial work that goes on there and which should not be interfered with by the pleasure craft. This would remove many of them from the area and give them this alternate port which they could use.

I want to also add that we should not overlook the fact that with one important harbor in the area, the Los Angeles Harbor area, if it should be under attack during wartime there would be in all of the area nothing between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara to the north, and practically all of the way down to San Diego, although there is Newport Harbor, in between, which is practically filled with small craft, there would be nothing else that anybody could use for emergency work of any kind, including that for the smaller craft which the Navy operates. In time of an emergency proper repair facilities in this proposed harbor would be very valuable.

I think it can be substantiated, without any question, that many hundreds and thousands of people would be serviced by this harbor if we can proceed with its construction.

The last point which I would like to make, although Mr. Thomson will expand, I am sure, on all of these points, is the particular advantage which I think will come about in the development of all of the related industries that could be created by having this harbor here, and the industries which would provide employment to our people.

As I am sure all of you gentlemen know, we have an ever-increasing population in this area, and our employment problem is going to be an ever-increasing employment problem, and this would create an additional outlet and provide employment for the increasing population.

I would like to add that one of my constituents in this area is one of the largest single employment agencies in the entire area, and that is the Hughes Aircraft Co.

The Hughes Aircraft Co. owns roughly about 25 percent of the land that would have to be acquired for this facility.

Now, the Hughes people acquired this land for the simple reason that their runway, which is to the north and a little bit to the west of the International runway, might be obstructed if buildings or industrial plants were put up in this area. It is, of course, a very important part of their national defense effort, because it is there that they take off on experimental flights and all of the other flights which are necessary to their work.

It was therefore felt by Mr. Hughes that he should acquire this land as he wanted to make sure that no industry came in in front of his runway and proceeded to erect smokestacks or other buildings which would be a hazard to the landing and the taking off of his planes.

He has interposed no objection to the building of this project. He is in favor of it, and he believes that it is a fine development for the community and for the people who work in his plant, and he, incidentally, is the largest single employer in my district. Therefore, I feel that his views should have some weight.

He has asked me to bring to the attention of the committee something which I feel is quite important.

He feels that it would be a tragedy if anything should happen which would mean that the project was begun and then not finished, so that the land would, perhaps, revert back for public sale, in which case, even though this land had been acquired by him and turned over to the Government he would be in the position then of having to rebid for it to again protect himself in respect to his runways.

I would like to ask this committee to consider that, perhaps, in acquiring this property there should be tied to it a provision that none of the actual work should be begun on this project until such time as all of the land that was necessary was acquired.

Then, I should like to make one small correction in Mr. McDonough's statement. I believe the amount of land which would be a part of the navigational area as proposed is about 1,000 acres; is that not right, Mr. Thomson?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Therefore there is a considerable amount of land to be acquired.

Mr. Thomson will detail to you that on top of the $2 million which has been appropriated by the State of California, the county is also ready with funds to acquire whatever else has to be acquired to complete the necessary land acquisition. Under a previous commitment, back in 1940, and which was reaffirmed, I believe, in 1951, the county has definitely assured Congress that it has the responsibility to go ahead and secure the land, even though, which I think is a remote possibility, in view of Governor Knight's letter, the State should default on their commitment to proceed with the money appropriated last year by the State legislature.

I do want to emphasize that I think, in fairness to and in protection of Mr. Hughes that there should be some safeguard included providing that the land will have all been acquired before work on the project begins, so that he is not left in the unfortunate position of having to rebuy what he has previously bought for the protection of his runway because it has a very important part, as I am sure the Department of Defense would agree, in our overall national defense effort.

I hope the members of this committee after hearing our testimony will feel that they can proceed with an appropriation for this project.

I agree with my colleague that $1,500,000 would be an excellent start in the right direction, but I do not believe that an appropriation in that amount is necessary to get the State started on buying the land, which is the first thing I think that we have to do here.

I think that the State wants a commitment of funds for actual construction in order that they may be able to answer any of the legal problems and others which arise as to whether the Congress is really committed to this project before the State uses any of that $2 million, and I think that, perhaps, a token amount at this time, in the discretion of the committee, would be sufficient now to get the project actually underway because, I think the facts of life are, as I am sure the committee knows, that it takes some time to acquire land through this process.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Roosevelt, for a very fine statement. You speak very skillfully and very persuasively.

Mr. MURRAY. Has the State of California already made an appropriation for the acquisition of land rights?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Last year the State appropriated $2 million from the so-called tidelands funds. Frankly it was a very smooth piece of work by the county and the assemblyman from this district. At the time the rush began for funds at the end of the session they got through this $2 million for the purpose of contributing to the purchase of this land. It was done based on the fact that this was not a project that just helped the County of Los Angeles, but one that would help a lot of other people in and around the area and, therefore, at least, in part, it was of benefit to the entire State. On that theory the appropriation was made.

Mr. MURRAY. Was the appropriation paid over by the State to the county authority that is responsible for this project, or was it retained by the State for the purpose of acquisition of the land?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. At the present time, and Mr. Thomson can correct me if I am wrong, it is still retained by the State, and the purchase of the land will be done in conjunction with and with the assistance of the county, and will be done by the State.

Mr. THOMSON. By the State.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it possible that if this project is delayed that the appropriation by the State will lapse?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There is always definitely that distinct possibility, in my opinion. The longer you delay, the more probablity there is that someone will come along and say, "Here is $2 million that we are not using, let us take it back and use it for something else."

Mr. MURRAY. Has this property been zoned? Is that what the State or county has done? Have they zoned it in order to prevent the erection of industrial structures on the site?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, sir; I do not believe it is zoned to prevent that.

Mr. HAND. Congressman, you mentioned a point which interested me in connection with your airport there. You said the nearest air-sea rescue unit was a considerable distance away from the airport. Can you fix that in approximate miles?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think by air-miles the nearest air-sea rescue unit would come from the Long Beach Harbor area, which would be about 36 or 40 miles.

Mr. HAND. Is that a Coast Guard installation?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think it is a Coast Guard installation.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Yes, it is a Coast Guard installation. It is not a straight distance, Mr. Hand. It goes down around Point Fermin.

Mr. HAND. What is the distance by air?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. By air I would say it is about 20 miles.

Mr. HAND. What is the nearest harbor of any consequence to this proposed project?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The Los Angeles Harbor area, including San Pedro, is the nearest harbor. By air that is about 38 miles, or 36.

The next place offering any kind of protection would be the Santa Monica breakwater, but it is nothing but a breakwater, which is exposed on both ends. That is a mighty poor place to be in a storm. I had a boat there once myself, and I almost drowned.

The next harbor of any size would be Santa Barbara to the north, which is a pretty small harbor, and over 100 miles away.

Then going down to the south there would be Newport and I would say Newport was about 50 miles.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Yes, fully that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. About 50 miles, roughly, and that, as I understand it, is not a commercial harbor in any way. That is wholly a small-boat harbor.

Then you go on down to San Diego, which is over 100 miles away.

Mr. HAND. Can you inform the committee as to whether or not this proposal has been formally presented to the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, I believe it is before the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HAND. Do you know whether or not any request for funds was made?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am sure they requested funds. I believe the request was not approved by the Bureau of the Budget at this time.

I would like to point out one other thing, which I think is important.

Normally these projects show a fair expectation of the Federal Government's benefits in proportion to the total outlay. In this particular instance the overall cost of this project is estimated at somewhere around $32 million, and the total cost of the Federal Government is estimated by the Corps of Engineers, the correct amount that they feel the Federal Government should spend is about $3,800,000, or 12½ percent of the total cost of the project. That is all of the Federal Government's share in the project. So that, certainly, the Federal Government is not having to stand most of it. The local community or the area is providing by far the major part of the funds involved.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Thomson, you have identified yourself and given your official position. You may proceed with filling in such details as you care to supply to the committee.

Mr. THOMSON. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, owing to the heavy pressure on your time, I will attempt to be as brief as I can with clarity, and you may be assured that I will be factual, and I will try to avoid any repetition of the testimony or the evidence that we have with us or that has been given by our two Representatives.

You have learned that 87 percent of this total estimated cost has been accepted by the local interests as the share that they will come forward and provide.

That is a formal commitment, as Mr. Roosevelt has mentioned, and is on file with the Federal agencies. It is not a matter of conversation.

We have no contest with the Bureau of the Budget.

Last year the Corps of Engineers recommended that the appropriate share of the total cost of $32 million should be about 25 percent or a little less than $8 million, but the Bureau of the Budget said in the case of small-raft harbors that they rescinded 50 percent of the cost of the general navigational features, which brings it down to approximately $4 million for the Federal Government.

We are not here to contest that.

We are here, gentlemen, to say that time is pressing us, and for reasons which I will explain.

What we respectfully ask of you is to afford us from Federal funds that amount that the Corps of Engineers would determine would be necessary for them to make their advance plans, which we call final plans, and also the construction funds which they believe might be obligated by them and matched by us, of course, in this next fiscal year.

What that amount is, I would not presume to say. I am confident that if the Corps did make that determination we would have such confidence in the Corps' integrity and ability that we would be satisfied to stand by it.

Personally I think that $500,000 might be adequate, or a quarter of a million, but we will leave that to the corps.

I am authorized to say that an addition to close to a half million dollars in cash which we have put into the capital projects' fund to show our earnestness in this project; I am authorized to say that we will add and have available $1 million for the purpose of its construction and planning for this coming fiscal year.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. That is, the county of Los Angeles.

Mr. THOMSON. And that is separate and apart from the $2 million of State funds which is available if, as, and when we can define the

exact area, about 1,000 acres, more or less, of this $1,750 acres of blighted land which will be the actual sit for the marina.

We are asking consideration at this time of the point that for some years we have zoned this 1,750 acres in the center of civilization, and with a tremendous increase in pressure on us, as light agricultural land, and unless there is evidence that this project is going to crystalize and that a harbor will be developed, we are threatened with a court action, the county of Los Angeels is. They state that under present condition this is arbitrary zoning, and we should permit it to be rezoned for the development of industry and commerce, which is not only an offensive idea to the residential community surrounding it, but one which would be absolutely destructive, because once 1 acre of this 1,750 acres is rezoned we cannot revise and rezone the balance.

The other point is the longer we wait for this to crystalize, and the crystalization would be effected by a Federal appropriation, however modest, there is a natural appreciation or increase of land values, and the State has warned us that if they have to pay a good deal more for this 1,000 acres that we believe will be selected, that the onus will be on the county for the delay involved. In other words, there will be a shrinkage of their appropriation by the increase in the price of the land as time goes on.

We have a further point that I must bring out, gentlemen.

Due to our terrain there is no other possible spot on our coastline that could be developed into a harbor. Our two existing commercial harbors, side by side, Long Beach and Los Angeles, respectively, are manmade at tremendous expense.

The area of their expansion is definitely limited by the physical characteristics surrounding them, and they are under pressure now to handle and process the world's trade into berthing and docking and deep-draft vessels that are carrying that commerce, and I am here to speak for both harbors and to say that they look forward with a great deal of anxiety, hopeful that this project that we speak about will come to reality in the near future, so that they can take from their harbors a great proportion of small craft now using that valuable space which is for the processing and handling of the world's trade for which they were designed and constructed, and on the potential revenues of which they plan to carry and amortize themselves.

I would like to point out that we are not going into this project, gentlemen, as a community luxury. We cannot participate in such things. We are entering into this to implement our regional economy, and, in turn, it will reflect favorably in our national economy.

Due to a shortage of harbor space the small-craft industry and traffic has practically come to a vanishing point in proportion to our population. In the 2 harbors there are about 4,500 boats berthed therein, small craft, while if we had the same average number of small craft as Pacific coast ports have that do have adequate facilities in proportion per 1,000 of our population, instead of having 4,500 boats in our harbors we would have between 40,000 and 45,000 boats in them.

Remember that with all of our blessings the Lord only gave us a little over 1,000 miles of coastline. We have only three natural harbors.

Therefore we do not experience what some people have the ability to enjoy on the east coast, and we are being denied markets for labors and materials that this tremendous demand for small craft would normally present to us if the needed facilities were available, and our people could get in and operate facilities for the maintenance and repair of those boats.

In connection with the costs, I would like to bring out that we would not conceive of this as one of those projects which you enter into and your costs keep growing.

Since the corps drafted their general plan of improvement in the late forties, there have been several circumstances which led us to believe that we might suggest to the corps alterations or modifications in the original plan that will in no way decrease the benefits or the utility of the harbor, but possibly increase them, giving a greater value for the dollar, and yet reduce the total cost of this development to the Federal Government and to ourselves.

I would like to say that we are giving you our need for action now and that time is pressing.

I would like to say that our major justification, I will repeat, is to establish a new market for labor and materials and a new center for business and industry and to implement both the regional and the national economic well being, because this is a regional project, and if you will notice on this map it serves not only a great proportion of the whole section there, but a great proportion of the population of Nevada. It will serve the majority of the population of California. If you will notice where the center of population lies, gentlemen, the center of population of the State is only 15 miles distant from this proposed harbor. In so doing we feel that it is going to stimulate the area, and this harbor will not merely provide for 7,500 or 8,000 boats in the harbor. Since this harbor was conceived people are rapidly going to a multitude of small craft from 18 to 24 feet long that can be trailer-drawn and land-based.

Therefore, we expect during the years many times the number of vessels that could be harbor-berthed in this harbor will utilize this facility and get into our western coastal fishing grounds and our channel islands which lie adjacent to this area.

Protecting our airborne traffic is most essential. We are told that the second heaviest air traffic in the country is now out of the International Airport, which is 1½ miles distant, a traffic of which over 85 percent of necessity must become airborne and experience its most critical flight period in gaining crossing altitude over the open ocean.

Admiral Sherman has reiterated the necessity of establishing a general search ad rescue unit in that area. He has no place to base such a unit from San Pedro up to Santa Barbara. They have that one harbor today that they can protect this tremendous volume of traffic with.

I would like to say that there is no prejudice in the State of California to this project.

Organized labor has consistently urged that it become a reality to revitalize the crafts and skills in mechanics in this important and specified field of ship repair, maintenance and construction.

Also, the Navy would have available to it a new location for haul out and repairs and a new source or nucleus of skilled craftsmen equipped to do the same.

It would, for the first time, open up the waters of our largest important sports fishing ground to a commercial fleet, which the operators of existing fleets say would be around 100 vessels carrying an average of 4,000 paid passenger fishermen a season, which is a tremendous industry in itself.

Since the largest of the important sports fishing grounds lies in the Gulf of Santa Monica it is too far distant to make it commercially practicable to utilize it by voyaging from our existing harbors and back in. Today practically all of our barges are idle, so necessarily in many instances the Federal interests are idle. Our quarries are on the point of shutting down, and this would give immediate employment for some 30 to 36 months for their qualified mechanics and skilled workmen.

It would create a new annual market for materials and labor estimated conservatively to be in excess of $12 million a year based on the experience of the harbor at Newport in the adjacent county of Orange.

Now, gentlemen, I would like, in leaving, to ask that you observe one thing, and that would be the small chart that I have inclosed with the other two. That shows that regardless of the revenues we send in to support our Federal Government the very small degree of navigational projects that we have enjoyed until an appropriation can be forthcoming.

If there are any questions left in the minds of you gentlemen, could I suggest, Mr. Chairman, if it is not presumptuous on my part, that in order to eliminate all possible questions that might remain that I request that you gentlemen ask me any questions that you have so that they might be cleared up at this time?

Mr. EVINS. You want everything buttoned up before you go back to California, I take it.

Mr. THOMSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVINS. You have made a very fine statement, Mr. Thomson, and we thank you very much for your statement.

Mr. HAND. How long has this whole project been under study and been planned? How long has it been under consideration?

Mr. THOMSON. The plans were started in the early forties. The corps completed its studies in 1948. In 1951 the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors recommended to the Secretary of War that it be undertaken. Last year it was authorized by your 83d Congress.

Mr. EVINS. Will you repeat for the record how much will be made available from the county and also from the State, in the event a half million dollars is approved by this committee? Based upon that amount of money being approved, how much in matching funds would then be made available for the project?

Mr. THOMSON. There is $2 million available of State money to purchase this site, the purchase to be made by the State, independent of the county, which will then turn it over to the county for development with the cooperation of the Federal Government.

Mr. EVINS. Will that $2 million be made available regardless of the amount of moneys that might be appropriated by Congress?

Mr. THOMSON. As long as there are planning moneys, Mr. Chairman, and some construction moneys to nail it down, then there is no question. The State cannot be criticized for putting some conditions in that to protect them——

Mr. McDONOUGH. In addition to the $2 million which the State of California has already provided, contingent upon Federal participation, there is how much additional that the county will commit itself to provide there?

Mr. THOMSON. At this time there is being considered an additional $450,000, and we will agree to commit ourselves to another $1 million if you gentlemen provide the appropriation that, as I call it, crystallizes this project.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The $2 million from the State of California and the $1,400,000 from the county of Los Angeles would make $3,400,000.

Mr. THOMSON. Please remember that over the coming years we are definitely committed by resolution of the full board to provide the balance of these projects' costs over and above that which is to be borne by the Federal Government. We have taken that responsibility officially and formally, and it so stands on your records.

Mr. EVINS. How far out does this harbor extend from the coastline? Does it extend out to include the islands shown here? How far out is San Clemente Island?

Mr. THOMSON. San Clemente is about 50 miles from the shore, and Newport about 24.

Mr. EVINS. And about how far north?

Mr. THOMSON. It would be about 80 miles north.

Mr. EVINS. And about 50 miles in?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes. If you will notice, please, that map is prepared by the Corps of Engineers, and I merely had it enlarged, because this sets forth what is the tributary area accessible to this harbor.

I ask you to notice that this harbor is located only 12½ miles from the center of our county's population. We have already noted that, and I do not want to confuse the issue by talking any longer than I have to.

Mr. EVINS. You have answered my question sufficiently.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Thomson, I think, said there is a suit concerning the zoning of this property in the California courts.

Mr. THOMSON. There is not a suit, but there are suits threatened if this zoning continues as agriculture, which prohibits this development and is arbitrary under modern conditions. And our county attorneys have advised us we would be on very dangerous ground if we try to keep it for another year with the tremendous pressure in that area, with subdivisions developing—that we would be on dangerous ground to go into court.

Mr. MURRAY. Do your county attorneys feel there might be such a suit?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes, sir. We have been threatened many times, and one reason there has not been is that we promised the people that the Federal and State Governments had entered into an arrangement——

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the question of zoning has been pretty well resolved because this project has been under consideration since 1940. Now the adjacent area, in 1940, was agricultural. This is a low part of the land where the silt from the waters of the Santa Monica Mountains drains down and deposits, and it is an area of rich agricultural land. There is no agriculture on the land at the present time, but the question of this being contested to be zoned for agricultural

purposes is pretty much out of the way right now. The question of its use for industrial purposes is a new move on the part of some people who think it could be used for that purpose. The answer to that is that it has been used for industry to the extent that certain oil wells have been drilled in the area and have been exhausted, and they are dry wells now and on much of that area options have been taken and the land acquired. The possibility of its being used as an industrial site for factory construction is the most immediate thing, and the attempts that have been made to zone it for that purpose are coming to the point that they cannot make much of a case of it, because this matter has been consistently under consideration since 1948 as a possible site for a small-boat harbor. So I would say the possibility of litigation because of the zoning is not too immediate.

Mr. MURRAY. I would like to ask a few questions off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. HAND. Mr. Thomson, I wish you would give me a little further information on the physical conditions we have here. We have no harbor whatever here now.

Mr. THOMSON. No, sir; no harbor whatever here now.

Mr. HAND. This is dry land, or semidry land now.

Mr. THOMSON. It is a tidal marsh. If it were not for the flodgates 65 percent would be inundated at ordinary tide.

Mr. HAND. And there is no natural protection except some protection which I suppose is afforded by the Bay of Santa Monica?

Mr. THOMSON. That is correct. That is one of the most protected areas and has a mediterranean climate. It has all-year-round sailing, cruising, fishing, and party boats, which would be a big industry, taking out 25 to 30 passengers, and would be not only a tremendous benefit to the hundreds of thousands that cannot fish now, but I mean in dollars and cents to our revenues from the harbor and the economic value of that fleet to our local economy.

Mr. HAND. I notice there are 1,000 acres of the bay which you are contemplating making into a harbor. What depth do you contemplate for that harbor?

Mr. THOMSON. At the entrance between the jetties, which are approximately 2,000 feet long, the greatest depth of the seaward extension——

Mr. HAND. How far apart?

Mr. THOMSON. 700 feet at low tide—the water area between the jetties we are talking about has a 1,000-foot width. That means there would be a water area at low tide of some 700 feet between the jetties. The jetties are 2,000 feet long, with a depth of 25 feet at extremely low tide in the entrance channel at the seaward extension of the jetties, and coming up to 20 feet where the channel would go through the shoreline. That is what we call the surge. Then as we go up the interior turning basin, 15 feet, and then the berthing basin for some 7,500 boats at 10 feet at extreme low tide.

You see, we do not have very extreme tides. The range of our tides out there is only about 5½ feet.

Mr. HAND. And it possibly follows from your last statement that you would not have any particular surge or unusual dredging problem by way of maintenance?

Mr. THOMSON. No, sir; it would be very reasonable, and the way it has been decided by the corps, and it has been studied by your National Shore Line Erosion Board, they feel it will protect and hold the beach rather than be an obstruction. And we have had no objections from any Federal or State agency in their studies.

Mr. HAND. Of course the pleasure craft you speak of and also the commercial fishing craft and the craft which take out sports fishermen for a fee are all estimates on your part. There is nothing there now; there is no harbor there now?

Mr. THOMSON. No, sir; there is nothing there now.

Mr. HAND. You are assuming it would be attractive for them if it was built, but there is no traffic there now.

Mr. THOMSON. That is right.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There is something to go on, though, because just beyond that Santa Monica area, there is, as I told you, that breakwater area with all of the commercial fishing craft that take out people today. And I think it is safe to say they are busy all year around. So this is not just a guess that it will be an attractive thing, but that is actually proven by the use that is being made today wherever such facilities are made available.

Mr. HAND. How far is that breakwater from your present coastline?

Mr. THOMSON. About 5 miles. And that breakwater is in a state of disrepair. It is condemned. It has been discarded as being a sand trap by the Corps of Engineers and they have refused to permit its ever being constructed again because of the effect on our beaches and the hazards of going behind it are so great. One reason there is so little traffic is that a vessel going behind that breakwater automatically blocks its marine access. In other words, the marine authorities consider it a hazard rather than a harbor. And that short stretch of breakwater, a little over a quarter of a mile long, is to be taken away as soon as the city of Santa Monica can afford the funds to remove the rock. The thing was an abortion from the day it was born.

Mr. HAND. In other words, it is in process of being threatened by abandonment?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. What is the general nature of commercial fishing in this area? Do you have any figures on the value of the annual catch?

Mr. THOMSON. This is the area of our largest mackerel and sardine catches. Although the Corps of Engineers have estimated that, I cannot give it to you ad lib. It is, however, an area that is practically unfished because it is so far distant from the existing harbors, yet sitting practically on the doorstep of 5 million people and practically in sight.

Mr. HAND. In the course of your local participation, would you expect to dredge the channel as well as the inner harbor, or is that part of the Federal project, to dredge the channel?

Mr. THOMSON. The Federal Government is committed today and the approved recommendation of the Corps is that they provide, as a Federal agency, the general navigational features which they have specified as the new jetties, the entrance channel, the turning basis or interior main channel, and the aids to navigation, which are only some $35,000, and all that coming to a little less than $8 million. And

the Bureau of the Budget says they recommend only 50 percent. We have accepted that, so we really are prepared to pay the other one-half of the cost that the Corps of Engineers recommended should be borne by the Federal Government, plus the rest of the entire development, and have guaranteed that it will be done so that your money does not stand wasted and idle.

Mr. HAND. I am still not quite clear on the answer to my last question. I understood your previous testimony to be that as far as the inner harbor is concerned you will have a 20-foot depth, 15-foot, and 10-foot depth, and you were speaking about the local authorities going to dredge that land and make a harbor.

Mr. THOMSON. At the 15-foot and the 10-foot depths; yes. We will furnish them with berthing basins.

Mr. HAND. Although you are expecting the Federal Government to dredge the channel?

Mr. THOMSON. We are expecting the Federal Government to pay for one-half of the channel navigation features.

Mr. HAND. How wide will the channel itself be? You have spoken about the width between jetties of 700 feet at low tide; but how wide will the channel itself be, or how wide do you contemplate it to be?

Mr. THOMSON. The center jetties about 900 feet.

Mr. HAND. You mean you are going to have an entrance channel and you propose an entrance channel of that depth and that width?

Mr. THOMSON. We propose an entrance channel that would be 700 feet of usable water wide.

Mr. HAND. 700 feet wide?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes.

Mr. HAND. It is necessary to have a channel that wide? That is a pretty wide channel.

Mr. THOMSON. Yes; but the corps believes that the nature of the wind and water conditions make it favorable; because with some seven or eight thousand boats there is going to be a lot of traffic in that channel.

Mr. HAND. When you say seven or eight thousand boats, you are talking about the traffic you might anticipate there?

Mr. THOMSON. We are talking about the accommodations that will be available in this completed harbor and we have no compunction about stating this harbor will probably be all signed up before it is completed, because the public's normal demand is for some 40,000 to 45,000 craft.

Mr. HAND. You propose to provide wharfing and berthing facilities for that many boats?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. Some discussion has been had with reference to the location of the Coast Guard station. Where is it with reference to this project, and what kind is it?

Mr. THOMSON. It would be the location of a general search and rescue unit.

Mr. HAND. Is there any Coast Guard station there now?

Mr. THOMSON. No.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. There is at San Pedro, around the point.

Mr. THOMSON. Yes; there is at San Pedro on the southern coast.

Mr. HAND. And that is how far away?

Mr. THOMSON. That is about 36 to 40 miles water distance.

Mr. HAND. Is there any official proposal that if this project is improved, there will be an air rescue station here operated by the Coast Guard, or otherwise?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes, sir, and Admiral Sherman last year permitted me to read his statement before the Rivers and Harbors Committee to the effect that it was very desirous and they were prepared and welcomed the location of such a general search and rescue unit.

Mr. HAND. Admiral Sherman is a Coast Guard officer, of course?

Mr. THOMSON. He is commanding officer of the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. HAND. In that area?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes, sir.

He is the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, the leader of the whole Coast Guard, right here in Washington, D. C.

Mr. HAND. The Coast Guard is definitely planning the location of a station here?

Mr. THOMSON. Yes, sir. And that has also been constantly recommended and requested by the various local commandants of that whole Coast Guard district.

Mr. HAND. Thank you very much.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JENSEN. I have just one question. I am quite sure it has been covered; but could you tell us in a few words what are the principal benefits that will accrue from this proposed project?

Mr. THOMSON. The principal benefits will be the establishment of a much needed general search and rescue unit base by the Coast Guard to protect the second heaviest airborne traffic in this Nation which must experience its most critical flight period in maintaining a cruising altitude over the open ocean immediately in front of this harbor.

The second, you might say, is the fact it will produce a new center for repair and haul-out facilities for naval craft and a new nucleus of trained skilled mechanics. It will prevent the practical vanishing of the small-craft industry in our community, which has come to that point because there are only two harbors and they cannot afford the space to permit small craft in any degree commensurate with our population or its demands. As I explained previously, we have only two harbors in a community of 5 million people, and there are many people coming from neighboring communities that would enjoy this harbor. We have about 4,500 boats in the water in those harbors and they are creating a congestion and interfering with commercial developments, and the harbors would like to encourage them to move elsewhere if there were any place for them to go. If we had the same ratio of small craft per thousand of our population as is enjoyed in the average of our other coastal communities, we would have 40,000 to 45,000 small craft. This will stimulate the small-craft industry that is now dying on the vine; it will reestablish and create a new market for labor and materials, implementing our economy regionally and nationally, and it will allow us to participate in this great increase in the boat industry which the lack of harbor facilities now denies us.

We are not approaching this as a recreational project; this is not a community luxury; this is a regional investment. It is estimated that

it should be self-liquidating and self-supporting. We are doing it purely for the economic reasons and had the studies directed to be developed in this harbor said it should be best used for handling oil, lumber, or baled hay, that is a direction we would have recommended that this utility be used. But its most pressing need is for a market that is now denied, and that is small craft for both commercial fishing and semicommercial fishing and privately owned pleasure craft.

Mr. JENSEN. To what degree have the local interests shown their good faith in this project dollarwise?

Mr. THOMSON. The present estimate is that for this total project local interests will have to come forward with some $32 million, of which the Bureau of the Budget recommends about $4 million of Federal money. Although the Corps of Engineers recommended twice that much, we are not jousting or bringing up any argument with the recommendations. We are satisfied—not satisfied, but we are so convinced about this project and time is so pressing that we are willing to take the $4 million as compared to the balance of $32 million which we have committed ourselves to provide. We are asking today merely that you gentlemen see fit to provide the Corps of Engineers with the moneys for what we call their final planning and whatever funds they feel they would be able to obligate for construction contracts in the next year. I do not know how much that would be and I leave that to the Corps of Engineers to advise you.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I might add to that statement by saying that the State of California at the present time has committed itself to an appropriation of $2 million and the county of Los Angeles has in its budget at the present time $450,000 and are committed to an additional $1 million this year. So that the $2 million, plus the $1,450,000 is $3,450,000 of local money that is immediately available. And that is contingent upon the amount of money this committee will recommend for appropriation to start the work. In other words the State of California says the $2 million is firm provided the Federal Government comes along with $2 million; the $1,450,000 of the county is firm provided the Federal Government comes along with an appropriation. And the amount we are asking of the Federal Government at the present time is only money for the advanced planning and what little construction work they might do in the next year. And that amount may vary from $500,000 to $1 million. The total amount that the Federal Government is asked for on the whole project does not exceed $4 million.

Mr. JENSEN. And you feel the Federal Government has the responsibility here to that degree, at least.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Definitely, for the Coast Guard air rescue port, for which there is at present nothing available.

Mr. EVINS. We thank all of you gentlemen for your very fine testimony. The resolutions offered by Mr. Thomson will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The resolutions above referred to are as follow:)

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1950.

RESOLUTION

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors William A. Smith, chairman presiding, Leonard J. Roach, John Anson Ford, Raymond V. Darby, and Roger W. Jessup; and Harold J. Ostly, clerk, by Ray E. Lee, deputy clerk.

(Minute book No. 357, p. 280)

In re Playa del Rey small-boat harbor project: Resolution amending resolutions adopted September 28, 1948, and June 7, 1949.

On motion of Supervisor Darby, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

Whereas a resolution was adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles on September 28, 1948, and a further resolution on June 7, 1949, finding and determining that the public interest of the county of Los Angeles and its citizens requires that provision be made for additional small-craft facilities by means of the construction of a small-craft harbor at Playa del Rey, and tentatively accepting certain obligations in connection with the construction of such a small-craft harbor; and

Whereas a further review of Report on Survey, Harbor at Playa del Rey, Calif., by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Corps of Engineers, War Department, as stated in letter of the district engineer, Los Angeles district, January 30, 1950, has indicated that certain additional modifications would be desirable prior to submission of said report to Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the said resolutions adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles on September 28, 1948, and on June 7, 1949, be and they are hereby amended by adding the further obligation set forth herein:

11. Contribute in cash or equivalent work the cost of dredging 11 of the 12 interior basins.

I, Harold J. Ostly, county clerk of the county of Los Angeles, and ex officio clerk of the board of supervisors of said county, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of the original minutes of the board of supervisors, as entered in minute book No. 357, page 280, in re Playa del Rey small-boat harbor project: Resolution amending resolutions adopted September 28, 1948, and June 7, 1949.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the board of supervisors, this 27th day of May 1954.

HAROLD J. OSTLEY,
County Clerk and ex officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
By RAY E. LEE,
Deputy Clerk.

TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1949.

RESOLUTION

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors William A. Smith, chairman, presiding; Leonard J. Roach, John Anson Ford, Raymond V. Darby, and Roger W. Jessup; and Harold J. Ostly, clerk, by Ray E. Lee, deputy clerk.

(Minute Book No. 348, p. 273)

In re proposed construction of small-craft harbor at Playa del Rey: Resolution amending resolution tentatively accepting certain obligations in connection therewith.

On motion of Supervisor Darby, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

Whereas a resolution was adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles on September 28, 1948, finding and determining that the public interest of the county of Los Angeles and its citizens require that provision be made for additional small-craft facilities by means of the construction of a small-craft harbor at Playa del Rey, and tentatively accepting certain obligations in connection with the construction of such a small-craft harbor; and

Whereas preliminary review of report on survey, harbor at Playa del Rey, Calif., by the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, War Department, dated August 16, 1948, has indicated that certain modifications would be desirable prior to submission of said report to Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the said resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles on September 28, 1948, be and it is hereby amended by adding to the obligations set forth therein, the following:

9. Assume the cost of extending the upcoast jetty at Ballona Creek flood-control channel.

10. Operate and maintain the entire project except aids to navigation, entrance jetties, and project depths in the entrance and interior channels, and in central basin.

I, Harold J. Ostly, county clerk of the county of Los Angeles, and ex officio clerk of the board of supervisors of said county, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the orignal minutes of the board of supervisors, as entered in minute book No. 348, page 273, in re proposed construction of small-craft harbor at Playa del Rey: Resolution amending resolution tentatively accepting certain obligations in connection therewith.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the board of supervisors, this 27th day of May 1954.

HAROLD J. OSTLY,
County Clerk and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
By RAY E. LEE,
Deputy Clerk.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

PALO VERDE DIVERSION DAM

WITNESSES

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
C. C. TABOR, ENGINEER, PALO VERDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT, BLYTHE COUNTY, CALIF.
H. D. UNDERWOOD, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, PALO VERDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT
LEON M. NOWELL

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be most delighted to hear our esteemed and beloved colleague, a very senior and very valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have an idea that the presentation will be brief and will depend entirely upon the committee as to what information they want.

I would like to present to you Mr. C. C. Tabor, the engineer for the Palo Verde Valley Irrigation District, who will make a short statement and who will give the names and the titles of the people who are with him. As a matter of record, I would like to say this has to do with the Palo Verde Irrigation District, and few things have pleased the Congress so much, I guess, over the years as the final settlement of that problem. After long discussions in which various figures of larger amounts were discussed, and various methods of solving the problem, we finally had a bill last year which went through both Houses and provided for the method by which water may again be returned to the lands, the delivery of water having been disturbed by the construction of the up-river dams on the Colorado River. You

have the first item in the bill this year for the construction of the dam. It is in the neighborhood of $2 million.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say, to expedite the hearing since we are rushed for time, that this Palo Verde Dam has been a source of great concern to the Interior Committee for many years. Finally we did get an authorization for it. It is an old rock dam; the old Palo Verde Rock Dam has been costing us thousands and thousands every year to maintain. The committee had always hoped that finally the Congress would get around to authorizing a permanent dam. They finally did. I might tell you that if Mike Kirwan was here, I could speak for Mike. He would say like I am saying that thank goodness this thing is finally coming to this point where we are getting a permanent dam which has been so badly needed for so many years, and is completely justified from the standpoint of not only the dam itself but for the irrigation projects surrounding it.

With that I want to say that if that will expedite the hearings, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you right now that I am going to be for this project.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is Mr. Tabor.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed.

Mr. TABOR. With me is Mr. H. D. Underwood, the president of the board of trustees of the Palo Verde Irrigation District, and Mr. Leon M. Nowell.

Mr. EVINS. You have a very strong and a very able advocate in your representative.

Mr. TABOR. Diversion from the Colorado River to the Palo Verde Valley started in 1877, which gives this locality the oldest water right in California on the Colorado River. Diversions have been continuous since 1908 and, until about 1942, were by gravity. Following construction of upstream dams, Hoover Dam (1935), Parker Dam (1938), and Headgate Rock Dam (1942), the stream bed and water surface lowered so that the district could no longer divert all its needs by gravity. This lowering was caused by the silt in the stream bed moving on downstream and not being replenished by the silt from upstream which was impounded by the dams. In 1945, the Federal Government constructed a loose rock weir in the river to hold the water sufficiently high for gravity diversion. The Federal Government has appropriated approximately $25,000 every year for maintenance of this temporary weir. Last year, after 9 years of studies and negotiations, the 83d Congress passed a bill, H. R. 8498, authorizing construction of a permanent dam to assist in the solution of this problem. The solution is a negotiated settlement and is not entirely to the district's liking; for example, the proposed dam will hold the water some 4 feet lower than the present weir. This elevation was necessary as a compromise with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to prevent flood hazard and waterlogging on the Colorado River Reservation on the east side of the river. The estimated cost is $7,099,000 divided as follows:

Dam, spillway, and intake	$4,538,000
Levees and drain on Indian reservation	2,061,000
Loan to district for modification of canals to fit lower level	500,000
Total	7,099,000

On this amount, the district is to pay $1,175,000 (an amount of $675,000 as determined by the Department of the Interior, plus $500,-

000 added by the Senate) plus the $500,000 loan, a total of $1,675,000. This is to be paid in 50 years without interest.

The district is willling to enter into a contract with the United States for payment of these amounts and to operate the dam at the district's expense.

The district is not a reclamation project; it has stood on its own feet financially. It accepted some Federal flood-control work (less than $50,000) in 1932–35 and accepted the weir ($250,000) in 1945. No new land will be added to cultivation as a result of the proposed dam.

The district also requests the committee to include in the 1956 budget the usual item of $25,000 for maintenance of the weir. This temporary structure must be maintained until the new one is complete.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Part of the cost is being paid by the Indians on the other side of the river in order to get benefit to their lands from the general development. Part is being paid by the Palo Verde Irrigation District on a basis estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation to be the fair share for the district to pay. That was increased slightly in the Senate. That was accepted without further argument by the Palo Verde District.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Phillips and Mr. Tabor, you are both supporting the fund of $1,985,000 which is in the budget for the next fiscal year?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. We thank you very much.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We thank you for this opportunity to appear. Would you like to permit the others to extend their remarks, Mr. Chairman?

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955.

WESTWOOD-SAWTELLE PROJECT, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

WITNESSES

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MRS. ROSALIND WYMAN, CITY COUNCILWOMAN, FIFTH DISTRICT, CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be pleased to hear from our esteemed colleagues, Mr. Jackson and Mr. Holifield of California.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

We have with us today the very able councilwoman—of the fifth district of Los Angeles, who is here on behalf of the continuation of construction of the Westwood-Sawtelle project. If it is in keeping with the procedure of the committee, I should like to yield at this time in order that she may make her presentation and catch an early afternoon plane to New York.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am here because of my interest in the whole flood-control project in Los Angeles. A part of downtown Los Angeles is in my congressional district. I would like to yield my time to Mrs. Wyman, a city councilwoman from Los Angeles.

Mr. EVINS. We will be pleased to hear your testimony. You may proceed.

Mrs. WYMAN. I will try to go through this as briefly as I can and make it simple for you.

Roughly, this map here on the table shows the area that we are speaking about. Here [indicating] is the Westwood-Sawtelle project, and how much is completed. It goes up here and all the way into this dotted line here [indicating].

We have at the present time in the city of Los Angeles five projects that are being held up. We floated a bond issue in 1952 when we had ample money to build our projects, but all our laterals are keyed to the waterflow into the Federal Government's project here [indicating].

Our problem is very simple. You can see what is happening from the pictures here. When it rains, we have a regular river flowing. When it rains in California, it really rains. It does not rain so often, but when it rains we get a real good rain. We have this area [indicating] that is quite hilly. Here you can see cars being completely covered by the water. There is a great deal of damage done to the homes in this area. This happens to be a very high-income-tax-bracket area. Bellaire is in one section, which is probably one of the highest-income-tax-bracket areas we have, and then there is Westwood. They spend a great deal of money for homes in this area, and every time it rains, because we cannot do our job, they get flooded.

All of our projects are keyed to the one Government project. This [indicating] represents approximately 15,150 acres.

Up in this section [indicating] we have 6,000 good acres that could be used for subdivision which we cannot subdivide at the present time because if we bring any more water on these people down below there is going to be real trouble. So the city has losses. We are losing revenue. Every time it rains we have to go out and clean the streets of the debris and take care of the catch basins and all of various other things that have to be done. We find this is making a great drain on our appropriations each year.

I have met with the people in this area time and time again. The great cry from our city engineer is that the Westwood-Sawtelle storm drain is where our water must flow to.

I just do not know how many reports I have. I have stacks of them. I know that you do not have time to read them now. Each of them says, "Very well, Mrs. Wyman, but we are in this situtation because all of this is keyed to this Government project."

It started in 1941. It stopped during the war. It picked up in 1947 and stopped again.

In this western end of the city we are in real desperate straits right now. We do not know what to do. Therefore, I am trying to appeal to you to speed this project up, give us the money—roughly $180,000.

I was talking to the Corps of Engineers and with the additional extra costs, they tell me that it would run about $250,000. It is about a $10 million program. You have spent about $2 million on it. Because of the money that you have already spent, it seems a waste of money if you do not go on and continue it.

The people within this area have really suffered. We have a new Mormon temple that is just glorious that has been built out there and they are very worried. It is probably one of the most beautiful in the

country today. They are scared to death with every rain we have. It is not getting any better.

I appeal to you if there is any way to speed up this project, give us the money for the plans so that we can start to go on it.

I do not know the politics involved, to tell you the truth. I do not know whether it is the Corps of Engineers who are not pushing it, or who. I think that some of you were out to see this project in 1953. I do not know how we can dramatize the issue any more.

I have some films that I think are ready now. It will take about 3 minutes to show them.

Mr. EVINS. You have made a fine statement. The still pictures that have shown here of the flood damage in the city of Los Angeles are certainly impressive. The project for which you are advocating the continuation of funds is a part of the overall city of Los Angeles' flood-control project, and the committee has had extensive testimony on it so far. I am sure that the committee will give every consideration to your appeal for the Sawtelle-Westwood area.

Mrs. Wyman, the committee will pleased to see the movies you have so kindly brought for us.

Mrs. WYMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to show you these films which may be of interest to the members of the committee.

(Motion pictures showing flood waters were exhibited.)

We, in California, hate to see this but we do have to take care of our people too. We do not want the chamber of commerce to take this up and use it against us but we do have a real serious problem and it is very hard to dramatize the flood problem in California because people really do not feel that it exists, and I know of no way expect visually such as this, to show the members of the committee how serious the damage is. They are still digging out from under it at the present time.

Mr. EVINS. The pictures show it very graphically, Mrs. Wyman.

How often do damages of this character occur?

Mrs. WYMAN. We have been having it almost every rain recently; the heaviest rain was a year and a half ago. This damage occurs now because, as I tried to explain earlier, the area is hilly and the water seeps in before it is built up and improved, and the water goes through.

Mr. EVINS. Will you tell the committee how much money you are recommending to do this work for the next fiscal year?

Mrs. WYMAN. $250,000. Here, again, I do not know just how to appeal to you in presenting this matter to the committee but I would like to see the work speeded up. I do not know if this is possible, and I may be saying something that does not fit in with your procedure; I do not know. But it has got to be speeded up; the city is wide open and we cannot build our storm drain and we feel that the Federal Government's plans for it should be concluded, and we do not know just where to go until we get the storm drain and flood-control problem solved.

If I may ask for the money, it would get the program speeded up. I would like to get that on the record because that is what we desperately need.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, Mrs. Wyman.

Mrs. WYMAN. Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. We will be pleased to hear at this time our esteemed colleague, Mr. Jackson.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, if I may, rather than take the time of the subcommittee, I should like to file a statement in support of the appropriation for construction, stressing, as Mrs. Wyman has done, very adequately, the urgency of this situation.

This is not a matter in which agricultural lands are being flooded; this is a matter where an urban area has been built up and where the urban area is suffering every time we have an abnormal rainfall. So, again, I would like to urge that the committee give every possible consideration to this matter and I should like to express my thanks to the committee for allowing Mrs. Wyman to make her presentation, too.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will add the following statement for the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

Mr. Chairman, I know from personal experience the heavy schedule of subcommittees in general and this one in particular, and I will not take a considerable amount of the time of this group to detail all of the reasons why it is imperative that some further construction on the Westwood-Sawtelle project of the overall Los Angeles County flood control program be instituted. I have, over the course of the past several years, appeared before this subcommittee and other official bodies, in an effort to obtain funds which could be used to further construction commenced many years ago on the Westwood-Sawtelle project. I am quite frankly puzzled at the long and inexplicable delay in pushing construction of a program which all acknowledge to be necessary and of an urgent nature.

Members of the Committee on Appropriations and other official representatives of interested agencies here in Washington have visited the project from time to time during the past several years. It may have been, that failing the sight of rampaging waters, the urgency of the situation was not apparent to them, but I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that during the seasonal and sometimes unexpected rainstorms, considerable torrents of water pour down the watershed of the Santa Monica Mountains, carrying with them tons of silt and debris which is deposited in streets, local drainage installations, private homes, and business establishments. The area proposed to be drained by the construction of the Westwood-Sawtelle system is located in the heart of one of the most highly developed districts in all of Los Angeles County. Since the Westwood-Sawtelle project was first authorized many years ago, thousands of new homes and business enterprises have been constructed. The need for immediate relief is so obvious to those of us who are in day-to-day touch with the actual situation as it relates to floodwaters, that the failure of the cognizant agencies of Government to assist in remedial action appears fantastic. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that Westwood-Sawtelle is a very small program when viewed in relation to the overall national obligation and the multitude of perplexing problems which confront this subcommittee, the full Committee on Appropriations, and the other agencies involved. However, Westwood-Sawtelle is one of the most important things in the world to thousands of citizens who have, at one time or another, suffered considerable damage during the torrential rains. Westwood-Sawtelle is also important to the friends and relatives of the several individuals who have lost their lives as a result of the flood conditions. A very small amount of money has been requested by the local authorities for continuation of construction of the partially finished project. It is my understanding that advance planning is completed and that work could be commenced immediately.

I should be derelict in carrying out my obligations if I did not come before you today with an urgent request for consideration by this subcommittee. The city and county officials in Los Angeles have urged action on Westwood-Sawtelle, and the State legislature has memorialized Congress to do something about continued construction. Unless some channel of administrative relief can be found, failure to include construction funds in the budget presently under consideration will mean that no possibility of work on the system will exist until 1957. In the meanwhile it is quite likely that thousands, or hundreds of thou-

sands of dollars of damage will result. I am confident that those of you who are here today representing the city and county of Los Angeles, will corroborate what I have said with respect to the immediate urgency of the problem. My advocacy of the Westwood-Sawtelle project should in no way be interpreted as minimizing the importance of the other programs and projects being presented by these gentlemen. We have a great and important program underway in the overall flood control undertaking, and each of the individual projects has merit. I simply make the point that one of the most meritorious appears year by year to be neglected beyond reason or understanding.

Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your kindness and consideration.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Jackson, for your statement.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1955.

WHITE WATER CANYON AREA, RIVERSIDE, CALIF.

WITNESS

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. The committee will next hear from our colleague, Mr. Phillips, a valuable member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, very briefly only. I appeared yesterday with Mr. Tabor, and at that time you will remember that the bells had rung upstairs and the committee was very anxious that the statements should be made short.

May I now submit to the committee a statement by Mr. Tabor to be placed in the record in place of the short statement he made at that time, and I call your attention to the second paragraph on page 2 which the clerk will point out to you, which I think is satisfactory, concerning the contractual point the committee raised at that time.

(Statement referred to will be found on p. 383.)

I come here today in a rather unusual role, to ask you to spend $10,000 in order to save $250,000.

Some years ago—and Mr. Bryant is here, Mr. John Bryant, the flood-control engineer for the county of Riverside, and the other gentleman is my assistant, Mr. Jaques, who is acting as his guide in the labyrinth of the Capitol.

I want to speak to you about a matter of the flood-control study in the White Water Canyon area. The Corps of Engineers has conducted a rather extensive investigation in which the spent, I believe, about $160,000; that money has already been spent.

Now, we have these drillings and soil examinations and everything to go along with the complete investigation.

The intent at that time was for the Corps of Engineers to build the necessary flood-protection works.

The city of Riverside desires to build this themselves, at their own expense—are willing to do so—I probably should not say they desire to spend the money, but they are willing to do it at their own expense, but we would like to use the findings of the Corps of Engineers. This would prevent a repetition of the spending in order

to get the same information which is already in the files of the engineers.

The engineers, in order to make this information available to us, have to spend about $20,000 more. They have asked for $10,000 in this year's budget, and I appear before you to say that if that amount of money is allowed the engineers, we are satisfied. A representative of the Corps of Engineers has told me personally they think they will be able to squeeze a little more money out to complete the survey.

Now, unless you would like to hear from Mr. Bryant as a matter of courtesy, Mr. Chairman, that will conclude my statement.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be very glad to hear him.

Mr. PHILLIPS. He is here really for the hearing this afternoon before your committee.

I think that is all I need to say to you at this time.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Phillips.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Thank you.

AFTERNOON SESSION

THURSDAY, MAY, 5, 1955.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIL FUNCTIONS, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

WITNESSES

C. A. ERDAHL, CHAIRMAN, PACIFIC NORTHWEST UTILITIES CONFERENCE COMMITTEE
E. ROBERT DE LUCCIA, PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT CO.
D. R. McCLUNG, PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT CO.
A. H. WEGNER, THE WASHINGTON WATER POWER CO., SPOKANE
THOMAS W. ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD, CITY OF TACOMA, WASH.
J. FRANK WARD, MANAGING DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON STATE POWER COMMISSION, OLYMPIA, WASH.
DEAN BARLINE, DIRECTOR OF UTILITIES, TACOMA, WASH.
PAUL B. McKEE, PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT CO.
JOHN S. DICKSON, PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1, OF WAHKIAKUM COUNTY
BOB JONES, SEATTLE CITY LIGHT, WASHINGTON STATE POWER COMMISSION
ROBERT H. SHORT, PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Tollefson is delayed at the moment because of some important legislation on the floor, and he may be here, I am advised, later.

We are going to ask each of you gentlemen to please give for the record at this point your names and whom you represent.

Mr. ERDAHL. I would like to present those here first for the benefit of the committee.

I may say, to begin with, that this statement was signed by some utilities that were not able to send anyone to Washington. It repre-

sents the Eugene Water and Electric Board, Ray Boals, secretary and superintendent; the Washington Water Power Co., K. M. Robinson, president; Public Utility District No. 1 of Wahkaikum County, Wash., John S. Dickson, Manager; Portland General Electric Co., Frank M. Warren, president; Washington State Power Commission, J. Frank Ward, managing director; Pacific County Public Utility District No. 2, Allen Rotta, manager; Mason County Public Utility District No. 3, Claude Danielson, manager; Pacific Power & Light Co., Paul B. McKee, president; Gartn County Public Utility District, G. A. Smothers, manager; city of Seattle, Bob Jones, chairman, City Utilities; Cowlitz County Public Utility District, O. G. Hittle, manager; Public Utility District No. 1 of Mason County, Dick Buechel, president; Grays Harbor County Public Utility District No. 1, F. J. Robbins, manager.

It is quite a representative group of the west group of the northwest power pool. These utilities represent approximately 80 percent of the electric consumers in our area.

What I would like to do, if I may, is to present the statement. I would like to read it. It is not a long statement. After that I would like to make one or two comments with reference to charts that we have. I would like to ask for brief statements, if I may, from the individuals that are here. I think that will cover the field quite well.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed.

Mr. ERDAHL. Gentlemen, this is the ninth consecutive year that the members of the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee have appeared before appropriations committees of the Congress to testify regarding the needs and problems of our regional power situation.

The power needs of our region continue to grow rapidly. A conservative estimate by the engineering committee of the Pacific Northwest Governors' Power Policy Committee is that the requirements of the region as a whole will increase by a minimum of 6,400,000 kilowatts between now and 1964. This estimated increase will very nearly double the present load, and to meet such growth an investment of between $2 and $3 billion must be made in power production, transmission, and distribution facilities.

In the west group area of the northwest power pool, in which the utilities represented here operate, the power load growth estimates are in proportion to that for the overall region. We face the responsibility of meeting a tremendous increase in the needs of more than 1 million customers, and the welfare and progress of the people of the Pacific Northwest demand that this responsibility be met.

The non-Federal utilities of our area clearly recognize that they have a large share of development responsibility on their own shoulders. In the past 5 years, they have expended $527 million on the construction of new facilities to strengthen and expand service to the public. We are prepared to spend an even greater amount during the next 5 years.

It is an inescapable fact, however, that our region must rely upon, to a large extent, the Government power-generating projects under construction to supply growth requirements between now and 1960. The time needed to plan and build large hydroelectric projects is such that no alternative program can be considered to meet our immediate problem.

This means that work on the multiple-purpose projects under construction by the Corps of Engineers at The Dalles, McNary, and Chief Joseph must go forward on schedule, or a power shortage will be imminent. The schedule requires $63,500,000 for The Dalles, $18 million for Chief Joseph, $11 million for McNary, $500,000 for initial planning for the John Day project, together with relatively small amounts for planning on other projects.

We urge, therefore, the full appropriation needs for these projects be allowed by the Congress. It also should be pointed out that once construction has started it is to the economic advantage of the Government that they be completed and put to work returning revenues to the Treasury as soon as possible.

Likewise, we urge the most favorable consideration of the budget requests for construction and for operation and maintenance funds for the Bonneville Power Administration. It is obvious that the development of the Government's transmission grid must proceed in step with the development of new generating capacity, and with the increase in loads at points of delivery.

The construction budget of Bonneville Power Administration has been reviewed carefully by the operating utilities in our group, and we feel that it represents a solid, practical, and necessary program of construction. We recommend its approval.

Also, we recommend favorable consideration of the budget request for operating and maintenance funds for Bonneville. It is apparent that a system which performs such a vital role in the Pacific Northwest power picture must be so operated and maintained as to give the greatest possible assurance of untinterrupted service. Any serious outage on the Bonneville system can affect the whole area, and cause widespread service difficulties.

Because of the closely knit nature of the northwest power pool operation, and because a certain degree of flexibility is highly desirable in Bonneville's operations, we wish to suggest that the Congress take this into consideration in its appropriation language and make it possible for actual operating conditions to be handled on an efficient basis.

Almost as urgent to our region as the maintenance of schedule on present construction is the need for prompt decisions on the start of new projects. We have no time to lose if we are to avoid a hiatus in our development when projects now building have been completed and their power output absorbed, as it will be almost as quickly as the generators start turning.

Much more needs to be done in the field of power development than we of the Pacific Northwest can reasonably expect the Congress to provide through appropriations. That has been well demonstrated in the past, and we would be less than realistic if we did not recognize that it will continue to be true in the future.

Since between 250 and 300 million dollars a year is needed in the Pacific Northwest for power facility construction, we wish to emphasize to the Congress that we need every Federal dollar we can get to support our river-development program, and every dollar that can be provided from other sources.

The local utilities of the area, as we have indicated, are ready, able and willing to make a very substantial contribution toward this overall capital requirement.

Large though our development task may be, it is one which can be accomplished if we work together.

It is clear from the record of the past, and from the forecasts for the future, that new major projects should be started at the earliest possible date. How this is to be accomplished, and by whom, is not a decision that we alone can made. It is a question which, to a large degree, must be decided by the Congress.

All we can do is urge most strongly that prompt decisions are needed, so that each responsible party can go forward with his part of the necessary power-development program, and essential flood-control and navigation benefits can be achieved. The Pacific Northwest cannot afford to have its growth stifled by a power shortage, nor can the Nation afford to permit this to happen.

Many possible developments are being advanced by local utilities of the area, public and private, and it is important to understand that each of these is being studied by its sponsors in the light of how the particular project fits into the overall program. We have learned from long and successful experience with the northwest power pool that the integration of our power resources brings benefits to all parties, and it is against the background of such experience that all of our planning is being done today.

We have already attained a high degree of coordination in our regional power operations and in our approach to the problems of the future.

Our request to you of the Congress is that each of these problems that comes before you for action be studied in the same spirit, and that you make it possible for our development program to be continued without delay.

Adopted at a meeting of the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee at Tacoma, Wash., April 26, 1955.

I might say that this statement was adopted by the Pacific Northwest Utility Conference meeting at Tacoma, April 26, 1955, and is signed by those that I have indicated to you previously.

Now, what I would like to do with your permission is to refer briefly to this chart that we have on our load growth. I would like to say at the outset we just put some figures together the last couple of days, and we find in the last 5 years the utilities represented by this group have put on the line new capacity that totals over 1 million kilowatts. So you see the non-Federal utilities in our area are not depending, nor have they in the past, entirely upon the Federal Government.

There are some projects, however, that we feel the Federal Government should very rapidly get started with construction money, or allow some method to be devised so we can do it on a cooperative basis.

This chart that I show you here at the end of the table represents from the years 1955–56 to 1964–65.

The top part of the chart indicates the requirements not met, and that is the interruptible power service mostly to the aluminum industry in our area. Then there is the firm load not met with hydro and then the prime power capabilities, hydro.

This is based upon a minimum year, 1936–37, that we used for a basis, and the area we represent when we speak of the west group pool is represented in that shaded area up to the right on the little map in the corner.

If we have a critical year this year, we will not be able to take care of the interruptible load, and we would not be able to quite take care of all of the firm loads with hydro in our area. And as you go along, of course, down to 1960–61 year, you will see how this black section gets larger and larger, first taking over the interruptible load, which amounts to about 600,000 kilowatts.

This large black area then, when it gets over to 1964–65, you will see indicates a shortage of approximately 2 million kilowatts.

So we have a problem of getting an extra 2 million kilowatts by that period if we are not going to be met with a very serious power situation in our area.

I want to repeat again, we feel, all of us, that this is not a job that the Federal Government can do and do alone. We feel as though it is a job that must be done by all of us in the power business—Federal, public, and private—and if we are going to accomplish anything, that chart represents the work we will have to do in our area.

Now, next, I would like to call on Mr. Luccia to indicate some dollar figures on a chart that he has. I think that it will give you a pretty good picture of what we are talking about when we indicate the dollar requirements that are going to be needed to meet this power situation that the large chart hanging on the easel indicates.

Mr. DE LUCCIA. Mr. Chairman, I should like to insert at this point a chart showing the Pacific Northwest power construction funds requirements.

Mr. EVINS. Without objection, the chart will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The chart is as follows:)

Mr. DE LUCCIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this chart shows Federal expenditures for projects which have power features, such as multipurpose projects, in the year 1946 and the year 1955, and is inclusive of expenditures actually made and the amounts budgeted for this fiscal year.

That is shown on the left of the chart. On the right-hand side of the chart are shown estimated amounts of money required on a minimum basis, in total, to provide the power facilities necessary to meet the loads in the area.

You will notice on the left the green bars collectively total $1,485 million, or an average of about $150 million a year for the last decade.

On the right the bars total $2,934 million, nearly $3 billion, or an average for future requirements of $300 million a year.

The subdivision of the bars on the right-hand side show in blue the amounts of money necessary, and estimated by years, to complete the Federal construction now going on, including the necessary primary transmission. The total stacks, by years, are inclusive of the amounts needed to complete the existing Federal program and the additional amounts are shown in red to meet minimum power requirements.

This chart has been checked with respect to historic data with the Army engineers and with the Bonneville Power Administration, and with the various United States budgets through the years and is believed to be reasonably representative of the funds expended.

On the right a similar check has been made with respect to the blue shaded areas, and as I said, the red are the estimated amounts based on the selection of dams that are possible of building in the Northwest and which are in various programs.

I call your attention to the farthest bar over, 1965, to give you an idea of how these money requirements mount rapidly as the years go by. You will notice there it has reached a total of $400 million. In the next year, which would be 1956, that would even reach higher, possibly approaching $500 million, because not only is the load expanding, but the projects which are more economical have been constructed, theoretically, and your combination of two kinds of things which increase the money. There is not any distribution or what we call in our utility business subtransmission, in these figures. These are, as I said, the costs of providing the generating facilities, the dams and powerhouses, and the related multiple-feature purposes that have to be built in with the structure and the primary transmission lines.

There is one other point: These figures do not include interest during the construction. I might say in comparison of the future years, the Bonneville Power Administration shows $3,500 million as compared to this nearly $3 billion. A difference of estimating costs on certain dams and things of that kind is the reason for the difference in the figures, but they are of the same order of magnitude and reasonably close.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you.

I think that we can let that chart stay at the end of the table for a while. We may want to refer to that again.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we have one additional representative, Mr. Robert Short of the Portland General Electric Co., who has just come into the room.

I think possibly I should call individually upon these gentlemen. They may have some short additional remarks to make. Then if there are any questions, we will all try to answer them. We are trying to be as rapid as possible in presenting our testimony.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, and your witness may make such statements now as they care to make for the record.

Mr. ERDAHL. I think that we will start on the end. Mr. K. M. Robinson, the president of the Washington Water Power Co., was unable to be here today, but Mr. Wegner is here representing him. Will you say what you have to say at this point, Mr. Wegner?

Mr. WEGNER. My name is A. H. Wegner. I am an employee of the Washington Water Power Co., at Spokane, Wash. I appear here as a representative of that company on the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee.

Our company was one of those responsible for establishing, on a voluntary basis, integrated operations of the Northwest power pool, and we have been a member of the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee since its beginning in 1946.

Each year since then we have appeared before committees of the Congress in support of the appropriations for the construction and operation of hydroelectric generation and transmission facilities by the Bonneville Power Administration and the Corps of Engineers. In common with the other non-Federal agencies of the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee we appear here today to invite and recommend your approval of appropriations requested for Bonneville and civil functions of the Army.

Engineering personnel of the utility agencies of the Pacific Northwest charged with the responsibility of power supply agree that as the area continues to grow it will require substantial amounts of additional generation in the period beginning in 1961 if all the load is to be carried in event of low stream flows. It is natural, therefore, that each of the generating agencies are aggressively initiating programs to expand power generating facilities as our company is doing.

While in 1952–53 we constructed and placed in operation the 200,000-kilowatt hydro plant at Cabinet Gorge on the Clark Fork River, we presently have an application before the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct a 400,000-kilowatt project, estimated to cost approximately $79,500,000, at Noxon Rapids site on that same river in western Montana. We hope to receive said license shortly so that work can begin this summer.

Also, our company has been working on a program to implement the area's power resources in the amount of about 125,000 kilowatts by constructing transmission facilities to enable us to purchase from our neighbors in Canada some power that may be surplus to their needs.

At the same time, we have associated with other utility companies in the Pacific Northwest Power Co.—a company formed for the purpose of constructing even larger hydro generating projects on the Snake and other rivers.

Power from these additional projects, as well as power from projects constructed by other utility agencies will be available to the area through the operation of the Northwest power pool.

These efforts of our company and those of other utility agencies are not expected to be sufficient to supply the needs of the Pacific

Northwest region 5 years hence, and it is for this reason that we appear here to concur in the statement of the Utilities Conference Committee that Mr. Erdahl has given you. May I conclude by saying that we join wholeheartedly in that statement.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you, Mr. Wegner.

Next, I would like to call on Mr. Don McClung, vice president of the Pacific Power & Light Co., who will give a statement for that company.

Mr. MCCLUNG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appear here on behalf of the Pacific Power & Light Co., in support of the statement of the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee which Mr. Erdahl has read to you today.

In company with other operating utilities we have reviewed the Bonneville Power Administration request for funds for operation and maintenance and agree that the amounts requested are the minimum amounts necessary to provide good and reliable service and we urge their provision.

With respect to the construction funds requested we have reviewed more particularly those items which are of particular interest to us and urge favorable consideration. In addition we respectfully call the committee's attention to item 134, the Alvey-Reston transmission facility. Load growth in this Oregon coast area has been very rapid. A special load survey made earlier this year indicates an even more rapid growth than had been supposed at the time the Bonneville budget was prepared last fall. Accordingly, Pacific wrote a letter dated April 15, 1955, to the Bonneville Administrator bringing this matter to his attention and urging an earlier completion date for this facility. I have a copy of this letter which I would like to present to the committee.

Mr. EVINS. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT CO.,
Portland, Oreg., April 15, 1955.

Dr. WILLIAM A. PEARL,
Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR DR. PEARL: Reference is made to our recent discussions relating to the power supply situation in the Coos Bay area. Because of indications of increased industrial activities, we recently made a special survey and find that consideration should be given to serving loads in addition to normal growth trends in the following categories in the Coos Bay-North Bend and Coquille-Norway areas:

PROBABLE LOAD ADDITIONS—KILOWATTS

Type of load	1955		1956		1957	
	Coos Bay area	Coquille area	Coos Bay area	Coquille area	Coos Bay area	Coquille area
Timber and associated industries	4,000	3,975	1,000	565	450	
Other industries				220	50	
Commercial			275			125
Total kilowatts	4,000	3,975	1,275	785	500	125

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

POSSIBLE LOAD ADDITIONS—KILOWATTS

Timber and associated industries			9,300	2,000	13,500	2,000
Other industries						
Commercial						
Total kilowatts			9,300	2,000	13,500	2,000
Total for area, kilowatts	7,975		13,360		16,125	

The addition of the probable loads to our forecast as submitted December 27, 1954, indicates estimated peak loads for the 1956–57 and 1957–58 winter seasons of 52.8 and 56.1 megawatts respectively. Including those additional loads indicated as possible results in estimated peak loads of 63.8 and 82.1 megawatts respectively.

Indications are that the so-called normal load increases may be higher than was estimated. Thus, we are faced with an extremely critical situation requiring relief at the earliest possible moment by completion of the Alvey-Reston-McKinley 230-kilovolt line. Although it is needed now, it is recognized that it will not be possible to complete construction this year. However, it should be possible to complete Reston-McKinley section by October 1956, as was discussed with you yesterday, and to complete the Alvey-Reston line for 115-kilovolt operation in October 1956, with 230-kilovolt operation by fall of 1957.

Obviously the funds in the total amount necessary to complete the Alvey-Reston-McKinley line for operation at 230 kilovolts should be obtained this year.

Very truly yours,

E. ROBERT DE LUCCIA,
Vice President and Chief Engineer.

Mr. MCCLUNG. The Tillamook transmission line, item 325, is also most urgently needed, and on April 15, 1955, we wrote to the Administrator advising that the power-supply situation is extremely critical in the Tillamook, Oreg., area and pointing out that recent transmission-line outages have resulted in serious interruptions to service. I have a copy of this letter for the committee.

Mr. EVINS. The letter will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT CO.,
Portland 4, Oreg., April 15, 1955.

DR. WILLIAM A. PEARL,
Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration,
Portland 8, Oreg.

DEAR DR. PEARL: As you are aware, the power-supply situation in the Tillamook area has been and is extremely critical. Recent outages of the existing Bonneville Power Administration line have resulted in serious interruptions to service. The capacity of the existing transmission line together with local generation in the Tillamook area will be unable to meet the December 1955 load. In view of this situation we again urge that the Gales Creek-Tillamook transmission line be completed at the earliest possible date and in no event later than November 1, 1955.

Very truly yours,

E. ROBERT DE LUCCIA,
Vice President and Chief Engineer.

Mr. MCCLUNG. It should be noted that the Alvey-Reston and Tillamook facilities are considered a part of the Bonneville grid and early completion is essential for the benefit of BPA customers in the Coos Bay and Tillamook Districts.

We also urge favorable consideration of planning funds for such projects as John Day, Cougar, and Green Peter, each of which should be started in the very near future. Non-Federal funds are available to assist in the construction of these projects and legislation to authorize such participation is pending before the Congress.

We have a tremendous job before us in the Pacific Northwest, as has already been pointed out. We have need for the help of everyone, and everyone who is willing and able to contribute to the solution of our regional power problem should be permitted and encouraged to go to work.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. McClung.

Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. deLuccia, do you have anything to add to what you said?

Mr. DE LUCCIA. I have presented by chart.

Mr. ERDAHL. Next, I would like to call upon Mr. Dickson, manager of Public Utility District No. 1, of Wahkiakum County, Wash.

Mr. DICKSON. My name is John Dickson. I am manager of Public Utility District No. 1 of Wahkiakum County, State of Washington. I represent our utility on the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee and I am here on the instructions of the board of commissioners of our district with authorization to fully support the statement of the conference committee as presented here today.

We wish to emphasize some of the points raised in the statement by Mr. Erdahl, chairman of the Northwest Utilities Conference Committee as follows:

1. Inasmuch as our minimum estimates indicate requirements for capital additions to the generating resources and transmission facilities of our region of $300 million annually, it appears to us that it is essential that the Federal Government should authorize the new start of a major Federal generating project, at an early date to supplement the investments being made or contemplated to be made by non-Federal agencies.

2. That every effort should be made to expedite and encourage the development on a cooperative basis, of non-Federal plants so that we in the region can make our contribution toward meeting these minimum requirements.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you, Mr. Dickson.

Next, we will hear from Mr. Bob Jones, chairman of the city utilities committee of the city of Seattle and also a member of the Washington State Power Commission.

Mr. JONES. My name is Bob Jones. I am councilman of the city of Seattle and for more than 12 years I have been elected by my colleagues as chairman of the city utilities committee. Also I serve as 1 of the 5 members of the Washington State Power Commission.

For the past 8 years I have come to Washington to testify as a member of the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee regarding the power needs and power situation of our area; therefore, I again endorse the statement of that conference committee in its entirety.

We in Seattle, like other electric utilities of the region, have spent large sums of money for expansion of electric facilities. For example, in the last 5 years we have spent $125 million for additions to our fast growing electric system and have added some 400,000 kilowatts of generation. At this time we have another $26 million construction program under way.

These figures are given to show that we are doing our best to keep up with our needs but with all this we must still buy power from Bonneville.

61653—55—pt. 2——26

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Washington State Power Commission also is doing everything in its power to meet the power situation in our area. At the present, that commission has under consideration the possible construction of steam generation to supplement Federal Government hydro and to put all the present hydrogenerated power to work.

I urge that full appropriations be made so that those multiple-purpose projects under construction by the Corps of Engineers may go forward. I also urge favorable consideration of the budget requests for the operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration and that we have full cooperation from the Federal Government on those projects that the State power commission and other non-Federal utilities have under consideration.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you, Mr. Jones.

Mr. Delzell, of the Portland General Electric Co., the chairman of the board, has not arrived yet. Mr. Short is here. Do you have something to say, Mr. Short?

Mr. SHORT. I have no statement for the record. It will be filed later by Mr. Delzell. I can say that our company heartily endorses the statement made by the Utilities Conference Committee. I believe that that is all that I can say.

Mr. ERDAHL. I wonder when Mr. Delzell gets here if his statement can be included in the record.

Mr. EVINS. It will be included in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF THOMAS W. DELZELL, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CO., PORTLAND OREG., RELATIVE TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, MAY 6, 1955

In behalf of Portland General Electric Co., I appreciate this opportunity to make a supplemental statement to the committee, and regret my inability to arrive early enough yesterday to have done so orally.

At the outset, let me reiterate that the management of our company supports fully the joint statement made yesterday by Mr. C. A. Erdahl, chairman, in behalf of the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee. It is our belief that it is vital that the several Federal multiple-purpose projects now under construction in the Pacific Northwest be kept on schedule. This comment goes also for the related transmission facilities as covered by the Bonneville Power Administration requests. Anything less than this would not only have bad effects upon the economy of the Pacific Northwest, but would also be false economy from the point of view of the United States.

Portland General Electric Co. is the pioneer electric utility in the State of Oregon. It is an Oregon corporation, managed by Oregonians, and serves in excess of 220,000 customers, all residents of Oregon. As such, and in terms of customers, it is Oregon's largest electric utility. It is owned by over 18,000 shareholders of whom 77 percent reside in the Pacific Coast States.

The management of this company has been a long-time supporter of Federal participation in resources development of the Pacific Northwest. The record will show that the company supported the construction of Bonneville Dam over 20 years ago and that, subsequently, it was the first customer of the Bonneville Power Administration. Since the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee was organized in 1946, we have been an active member and had been represented annually at hearings, such as this, before the committees of Congress.

We take note of the facts that the Congress has been generous over the years with respect to appropriations for our multiple-purpose projects, most of which have to do with the generation of electric power, and that it has become increasingly difficult to secure, what we might term adequate, appropriations over the past few years, primarily because of concern over the national debt situation and the priority of other appropriations. This has been true regardless

of whether it was a Democratic or Republican administration. We also take note that while the Congress has been generous with its appropriations for our area, they have never been large enough to do the entire job, which, in my opinion, is neither surprising nor wrong. On the contrary, the local electric companies and municipal utilities have, throughout the years, spent in the aggregate many hundreds of millions of dollars in the construction of needed generating plans and related facilities.

The area with which we are concerned is known as the western group of the Northwest power pool and, roughly, comprises the northerly half of Oregon, the State of Washington, and the northerly half, or Panhandle, of Idaho. This is one of the fastest growing areas in the United States. Also, despite the fact that we probably have the highest per capita consumption of electric energy in the United States, and perhaps the lowest average rates, the use of electricity is growing even more rapidly than the population. As you know, the use of electricity tends to double every 10 years or less. Looking ahead, therefore, at our future needs, we anticipate capital expenditures aggregating $3½ billion in the ensuing 10 years, or at an average annual rate of about $350 million. It has been and is the belief of our company that the job of raising this capital, and installing the necessary facilities, will require the combined efforts of the municipal utilities, the private electric companies, and the Federal Government, which are the three agencies now responsible for electric service in the area described. We anticipate that the amounts under discussion may well be much larger than the Congress, in its wisdom, will decide is appropriate for Federal investment in the Pacific Northwest. We further anticipate that the non-Federal agencies, whether they be public or private, can provide a large share of the funds needed, and must, to take care of the demands.

In many cases, however, this will require the cooperation of the Federal Government in respect to amendatory legislation which will permit such local interests to participate financially in the construction of various multiple-purpose projects authorized for Federal construction. In other cases, and to get on with the job, we will also need favorable action by the regulatory authorities with respect to licenses. For illustration, this company, the Pacific Power & Light Co., and the Washington Water Power Co., which serve approximately 600,000 customers, or virtually 2½ million people, are prepared to proceed with projects estimated by the Government to cost almost $700 million, and which would generate approximately 2,400,00 kilowatts; but, with respect to 2 of the projects, will require Federal Power Commission licenses, and with respect to 2 others, will require legislation by the Congress before we can financially participate in the construction of such projects alone or with the further cooperation of other private utilities or public agencies.

In varying degrees, this same comment is true of several of the municipal utilities. In using this term municipal utilities, I mean not only municipalities, but people's or public utility districts, or, in respect to the State of Washington, the State power commission.

Over the years, the electric utilities serving the area in question have spoken with a remarkable degree of unanimity through the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee. This is true as of this date. From a recapitulation of the customers served, the electric companies and public agencies subscribing to the joint statement of yesterday, represent approximately 1 million customers out of something in excess of 1,300,000 total customers in the area under discussion. This is approximately 75 percent, and perhaps in excess thereof. I have no knowledge that a majority of the 300,000 customers would not subscribe to the statement of the conference committee of yesterday. However, I would be less than candid not to comment that there is a school of thought in the Pacific Northwest that the Federal Government is responsible for supplying the entire power requirements of the region which, on the basis of the needs, would imply Federal appropriations of $3½ billion in the ensuing 10 years. This school of thought has some articulate spokesmen and I am inclined to believe that a number of the smaller public agencies go along with this philosophy. While we have no quarrel, as such, with these people on account of their views, the public and private agencies responsible for providing electric service to an overwhelming majority of the people in the area believe this is not a realistic approach. This we believe is true because the Federal Government never has supplied the entire power requirements of the region and we do not believe that it will do so in the future. The end result of this philosophy, then, would be severe power shortages which will commence in the early 1960's. It is highly important, therefore, to keep the Federal plants now under construction on

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

schedule, although they in themselves will not avert this shortage, and it is imperative that many other projects be started as soon as possible by the non-Federal agencies but with the full cooperation of the United States, where its interests are involved, with respect to flood control, navigation, or irrigation, and other general public benefits.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you very much.

Next is Mr. Tom Anderson, chairman of the Utility Board of Tacoma. Do you have anything that you would like to say at this point?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, the city of Tacoma is not shown as a signatory to this statement of the Northwest Utilities Conference Committee, but we are presenting a statement as a member of another group at a hearing we understand will be held tomorrow.

However, we are in complete accord with the statement which has been presented here today by the conference committee.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ERDAHL. We will now hear from Mr. Ward, manager-director of the Washington State Power Commission.

Mr. WARD. I have a prepared statement that Iwould like to have included in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF WASHINGTON STATE POWER COMMISSION

The Washington State Power Commission was established by act of the State legislature in 1953, and provisions of the act were reconfirmed by the legislature in 1955 as follows:

"Section 18. It is the intent of this Act and this chapter that the commission shall represent the State of Washington and aid and assist the public utilities therein to the end that its water resources and other resources shall be properly developed for the best public interest insofar as they affect electric power * * *"

The Pacific Northwest had experienced a period of power curtailment in the winter of 1952–53, just prior to the session of the legislature. The situation was one which had been anticipated for a number of years by utilities of the Northwest. It was generally recognized even before this power shortage developed that some legal means was needed to permit the various public agencies of the State to undertake jointly some of the power projects still available for development, most of which were too large or too remote from the point of use to allow development by any single agency. Establishment of the commission and the provisions of the law make this possible.

The development of the Columbia River by the Federal Government has been carried on for many years under a public-works program that was expanded because of national security needs for power supply and for military production in the area.

The people of the Northwest are greatly obligated to the Congress for maintaining the large rate of appropriations for Northwest projects through the past years.

The commission lends its full support to maintaining the construction program for which this session of Congress has been requested to make appropriation.

Public and private agencies in the area have realized that the Northwest could not remain dependent on the Federal program of construction when such dependence would require allocation of funds to the Northwest disproportionate to the need for similar funds in other parts of the country, and have made large investments in power facilities on their own account.

The Washington State Legislature recognized the need to serve all parts of the public in the State, and with due regard also for the needs of neighboring communities having mutual concern for future power supplies, established the commission, giving it authority to deal with all parties involved in the electric industry of the Northwest.

The commission has only had about a year in which to make some contribution toward meeting the power needs of the area.

The first step taken was to determine how serious the need would be in that future interim period between completion of projects presently scheduled and under construction by the Federal Government, and the bringing in of additional projects by the Government or by joint efforts of all parties.

Briefly stated, if no new major hydropower projects are built in the area in the meantime, the power shortage may increase from a nominal 200,000 kilowatts in 1961 to 1,200,000 kilowatts in 1963–64 in excess of all facilities which will then exist. The streamflow conditions which could produce such shortages occurred in 9 of the 25 years between 1925 and 1950.

Events of the last decade, and the prospects of the decade ahead impress utility people of the area with the need to consider sources of power which will supplement the hydropower sources of the Columbia Basin. This has been emphasized by the increasing difficulties which attend the planning, initiation, and completion of hydroprojects.

The one supplemental source most prominently considered is that of steam-electric generation. Eventually, of course, as in the history of other parts of the country, dependence for additional power supply must be placed on this type of generation. In the immediate future, however, the combined use of major hydro resources and new steam-generated sources offers the best prospect for early solution to pressing power problems. The period required for design and construction of steam plants, which is relatively short as compared with the 10-year period experienced with hydro developments, warrants consideration of steam plants under present circumstances.

Combining steam and hydroenergy will require the use of the present Federal transmission system. Expanding the transmission network for general use to accomplish this and to meet the large demands of the future may require some new legislation. When this problem is presented to Congress full cooperation in securing changes in law is anticipated. These changes will tend to reduce future needs for Federal appropriations and to increase the responsible part which local agencies may take in their area development.

In the meantime, the Washington State Power Commission anticipates undertaking the construction of steam electric generating facilities so that all the kilowatt-hours of energy that can be produced from varying stream flows can be put to work with steam-generated energy which the area itself will provide.

It is essential that the schedule of construction of Federal projects now under way be maintained while the details of greater joint undertakings in the area are worked out from both the legislative and a financial viewpoint.

The John Day project is a case in point. No time should be lost in carrying out the engineering studies for which funds have been requested. Such studies must be completed in any event before conclusions can be reached on joint efforts to finance the project. In addition, this project offers the greatest possible contribution to power supply in advance of providing extensive upstream storage reservoirs and also increases the amount of hydroenergy which can be supplemented if need be by steam generation.

Mr. WARD. The commission, a State agency, was established by the 1953 legislature, and the provisions of the law were reconfirmed by the recent legislature of 1955.

We are not operating utility as the other utilities who have appeared here today are, although we have the authority to become one should such a situation become necessary.

In the years since we have been actively engaged in studying the power situation, we have been giving particular attention to the need for steam generation, which might supplement the hydro of the area so as to cover any gap that might exist between the completion of the Federal projects and projects of others in the area, or additional Federal projects. In other words, we think there is likely to be a period from 1961 to 1963–64 when there may be a very serious shortage pending the coming in of new hydrogeneration. In the meantime, we would like to have some steam generation available to utilize such power as can be obtained from the Federal system due to varying stream flows and get the most out of the present Federal systems that can be gotten.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

We support, of course, the request for appropriations made before the committee today, and we think also that it would be very desirable in making provision for the future regardless of how the project might be built, to have the study work of the John Day project gotten underway with the idea if some scheme is worked out later to finance that through the utilities of the area, then the Federal Government can promptly be reimbursed by those costs as a part of the project costs.

We appreciate being heard today. This is the second time that I have appeared before you for the Washington State Power Commission, although I have appeared here many times before for the city of Tacoma light division, where I was superintendent.

We hope that the committee will see fit to pass the appropriation so we will have a good chance to take on the load for ourselves in this interim period when we either assume the larger share of the area by the efforts of the local utilities, or the Federal Government reenters the picture actively with large projects.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you, Mr. Ward.

Mr. Barline, do you have anything to say?

Mr. BARLINE. I have nothing to add to what Mr. Anderson has said.

Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. McKee, do you have anything to add?

Mr. MCKEE. No.

Mr. ERDAHL. Gentlemen, those are the statements of our group. I just want to say how appreciative we are of your time. I sometimes wonder when we come back and try to present our story in a half hour's time if we are doing the job of impressing upon you the seriousness of our situation. We want to repeat, or I want to repeat, that the people in our area have been very willing over the past several years, and able, I might say, to build some of these large projects and are willing to attempt to do them in the future, as has been indicated by the statement where non-Federal utilities in our area had put on the line 1 million kilowatts in the last 5 years.

It takes additional money, of course, for transmission and distribution.

What we would like to find, if possible, is where that level of appropriations is that we might expect from the Federal Government, such as that chart at the end of the table would indicate. If we can depend upon a certain level of appropriations from the Federal Government bringing in so many kilowatts annually, then we will know where we stand. If we do not, we are working with a somewhat unknown quantity, and I know that is a big question, but we hope that you gentlemen will give us every consideration in attempting to solve the problem between us so that we can have adequate kilowatts for the area to meet the needs of the area that is growing rapidly, as are other areas throughout the United States.

I am sure that that includes your area, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Erdahl.

I would like to thank all those who have come here and are associated with you for the statements that they have made. I personally have been impressed with the unanimity and accord with which you people from the Northwest come here and present your case annually to the Committee on Appropriations.

I understand that you have had a high degree of harmony and cooperation and unity between yourselves within the past several years. I commend you for that.

I have been impressed with your statement, and I feel that the committee will want to ask some questions for additional detailed information.

I merely want to thank you at this time, and I believe we will take a recess because of a vote on the floor at this time.

Mr. Erdahl, when the committee recessed, we had heard your statement and other witnesses in support of the appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration and the Corps of Engineers.

To repeat, I will say that I have been impressed with the unanimity of opinion of you gentlemen and the cooperation which is existing in your area. Has it always been that way or when did this cooperation become so unanimous; how long have they been getting along in such a satisfactory manner?

Mr. ERDAHL. We have been coming before the Congress for this, I believe, is the 9th year; we started coming back in 1947 as a group of public and private utilities after a series of meetings with the Corps of Engineers of the area, the Bonneville Power Administration, and I think, year by year, we find ourselves more closely together on these problems that are of so much concern to the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. EVINS. You are to be commended for that cooperation.

When the officials of the Bonneville Power Administration were before this committee, I asked them if their budget had been submitted to you and approved by all of the interested parties in that area, and I believe they all testified that such was the case.

Mr. ERDAHL. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. Some testimony was given here earlier that certain private moneys were available for building new hydroelectric generating capacity, following the enactment of legislation which is pending. How much would you say, approximately, in round figures, was available for this purpose in that area?

Mr. ERDAHL. I might interject, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, if you do not mind, that it is private and public money, not Federal.

Mr. EVINS. You refer to it as non-Federal?

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes; we refer to it as non-Federal.

Mr. EVINS. Could you tell us approximately, in round figures how much of public utility districts, and how much private money might be made available for this purpose?

Mr. ERDAHL. The amount of money that is available, in the report that I have from the individual utilities, both public and private, for the next 5 years, and in that fashion it runs to quite a staggering amount; actually, it runs up to about $1.8 billion, the amount that the individual private and public utilities are willing to spend, to make this program work. This amount includes some projects that will be started, but not completed, within the 5 years.

However, much of that would call for cooperative legislation; that amount of money could not be spent unless the Federal Government enacts some cooperative legislation.

Mr. EVINS. Do you have that in such shape that you could submit a statement on it for the record?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. ERDAHL. It is in rough shape, but if I might be permitted to turn it over to you tomorrow, I can do so.

Mr. EVINS. I wish you would just leave it with the clerk for inclusion in the record at this point.

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes.

(The information requested follows:)

Estimated construction expenditures for generation, transmission and distribution facilities 1955–60

City of McMinnville	$400,000
The Washington Water Power Co	111,272,000
Grant County PUD	364,525,000
City of Eugene	24,457,000
Puget Sound Utilities Council (city of Seattle, city of Takoma, Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Chelan County PUD, Snohomish County PUD)	670,000,000
Pacific Northwest Power Co	320,000,000
Portland General Electric Co	142,300,000
Pacific Power & Light Co	140,776,000
Grays Harbor County PUD	3,450,000
Mason County PUD No. 3	618,000
Pacific County PUD	855,000
Washington State Power Commission	50,000,000
Cooperating municipals, PUD's and others, not otherwise included	65,000,000
Total	1,893,653,000

Mr. EVINS. Now, from looking at your first chart here, under requirements not met, they will be greater from about 1959; which is a peak year.

Mr. ERDAHL. In 1958 and 1959, under minimum water year conditions, because of projects coming on the line between now and then, if they are kept on schedule, will meet everything except this amount of interruptible power in the minimum water year, which amounts to about—I think that figure is approximately 600,000 kilowatts of uninterruptible power.

Mr. EVINS. In view of the projected and declared needs for the future, we must have some legislation to implement the cooperative program or the Federal Government must go ahead on the building of hydropower, multipurpose projects in the area, to meet the need?

Mr. ERDAHL. I think you say it much better than I do.

Mr. EVINS. I believe I see the problem in your area, that either the Federal Government is going to have to go ahead to meet the demand for hydroelectric power in the area, or the planned cooperative programs must be implemented by legislation. Is that about correct?

Mr. ERDAHL. I think that is correct. Might I suggest at this point that we found over the past 9 years that the level of appropriations that the Congress has been willing to provide for the area has not been sufficient to meet the load growth in the area, and that is why I mentioned the figure of the last 5 years of the non-Federal installations in the area, of about 1 million kilowatts, other than Federal installations. Non-Federal installations include both public and private.

We would like to hope that the Congress will provide a level of appropriations that they would be willing to maintain.

Then we would like to have cooperative legislation to see that the balance was provided by some sort of an arrangement, some of which would be accomplished by construction strictly by public agencies,

and private agencies, but a big share of it would have to be from cooperative legislation by the Congress.

Mr. EVINS. In the absence of cooperative legislation, how much funds, annually, do you think need to be appropriated by the Congress to go ahead to give you the minimum needs?

Mr. ERDAHL. You mean if the Congress were to put up all the money?

Mr. EVINS. Yes, on that basis.

Mr. ERDAHL. Our figure is roughly, at this point, about $300 million annually.

Mr. EVINS. $300 million annually?

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes; and by this chart you will see that by 1965, you will find that the amount of money necessary to meet the requirements is our area would be approximately $400 million annually.

Mr. EVINS. Now, let me see if I interpret this chart correctly; the 1956 blue represents hydroelectric power on multipurpose projects under way, and they are going to be declining year after year?

Mr. ERDAHL. This blue indicates, from 1956—I think that is correct, but just to be sure——

Mr. EVINS. That is just for 1 year?

Mr. ERDAHL. 1956 is the requested amount by the Corps of Engineers, to allow the construction of the Federal projects to go forward as the Corps of Engineers has set them up under their schedule X.

Mr. EVINS. Now, let me see if I have that correct: If the Corps of Engineers' requests are granted—this represents the fund requirements; it does not represent the power situation?

Mr. ERDAHL. Fund requirements, dollar requirements, that is correct. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that also includes—and I wish Mr. deLuccia would watch this statement very carefully—that includes the Corps of Engineers and the Bonneville transmission lines.

Mr. DE LUCCIA. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. But the Federal Government's participation is represented by the blue; and the red is the funds?

Mr. ERDAHL. The red is something that the Federal Government will have to tell us, we hope at an early time—is the level of appropriation that they would set; the rest would have to be met by some cooperative legislation; on a partnership or cooperative approach.

Mr. DE LUCCIA. The Federal Government has spoken now for the amount shown in blue.

Mr. EVINS. That is what I understand.

Mr. ERDAHL. They have spoken as far as the——

Mr. EVINS. As the recommendation is concerned?

Mr. ERDAHL. The recommendation. Of course, the Congress makes the final decision in that part of the program.

Mr. DE LUCCIA. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. The direct appropriation is going to have to be substantially increased over the years, to meet the demand or joint funds provided?

Mr. ERDAHL. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. If the Corps of Engineers' recommendations are carried out, as presently planned, they will be quite—well, inadequate is not the word——

Mr. WEGNER. They would have to pick it up here [indicating].

Mr. EVINS. Yes.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. ERDAHL. We did not want to leave the impression with you gentlemen that we were hoping that the Government would drop to this level of appropriations [indicating]. We were hoping that the Federal Government would stay in this picture with us to the extent that they can and will, but that is the only figure that we could use, because that is the only plans that are developed thus far.

Mr. EVINS. Do you have a chart which shows the hydroelectric power which will be generated following completion of the existing facilities under construction?

Mr. DELUCCIA. We do not have such a chart, Mr. Chairman. There are about 7.5 million killowatts now operating in the area; about 3.5 million killowatts will have been completed, in addition to the amount shown in blue, having been expended, and the figures necessary by 1965 to meet the total will be about 14,500,000. So the difference between the addition of 7.5 million and the 3.5 million, and the total figure of 14.5 million would represent the amount of kilowatts that must be provided, which are not now provided in terms of any funds.

Mr. EVINS. And will someone tell the committee for the record what is proposed by the conference——

Mr. ERDAHL. The Pacific Northwest Conference——

Mr. EVINS. Yes, the Pacific Northwest Conference Committee in the way of supplying steam generation for your power facilities?

Mr. ERDAHL. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that at the last meeting in Tacoma on April 26, we finally completed a task force, in cooperation with the Washington State Power Commission, which is a steam study group, and on that committee will be representatives of all of the public and private utilities in the western group area, the Washington State Power Commission, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bonneville Power Administration, and they are immediately going to start a series of meetings and discussions to determine, not who will build steam, but where steam will fit into the area, to use up surplus power that might be available for firming up steam, as it would fit into the picture to possibly do a job that we are now depending upon for hydro.

Mr. EVINS. You say that study is underway?

Mr. ERDAHL. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. We have had some testimony before this committee earlier that on the west coast, in certain areas, there are no more desirable sites for large dams for hydroelectric power facilities.

Now, what is your view with respect to that testimony?

Mr. ERDAHL. My suggestion, Mr. Chairman, because I want all of these men to feel that if there are any additional points that I have not covered, because we want the record to be as accurate as possible, is that this west side of the State of Washington primarily is a project being developed on the Cowlitz River by the city of Tacoma over here [indicating] and they are going forward with that project, and they have just recently called for bids and that will develop an estimated 450,000 kilowatts.

Then the Pacific Power & Light have some additional capacity that they are going to put in approximately in that area [indicating] that I have been telling you about.

Mr. MCCLUNG. In Washington, there are about 250,000 kilowatts of capacity which we are investigating on the Lewis River. We have joined with some other utilities in the Northwest to investigate and

develop a stretch of the middle Snake River which will produce about a million kilowatts.

We hope that legislation will be enacted which will permit us to join with other agencies in the construction of the John Day project by the corps, which will give us about 1,100,000 kilowatts; the Green Peter project in Oregon has enabling legislation pending; then there is another project on the Clear Water River being actively considered by a group of utilities, including Pacific Co.

So there is under consideration, and very active consideration, close to 3 million kilowatts.

Mr. ERDAHL. I might say, Mr. McClung. that the chairman requested information on this west slope first. What Mr. McClung has outlined are projects that border on the west slope and others to the east.

Mr. MCCLUNG. That is right.

Mr. ERDAHL. That is east of the Cascades.

Mr. EVINS. Now considering the membership of the Pacific Northwest Utility Conference group, how well balanced is this committee, composed, we will say, of Federal and non-Federal power groups; how well balanced is the conference?

Mr. ERDAHL. Let me ask a question at that point, Mr. Chairman. Are you speaking of the east group as against the west group pool?

Mr. EVINS. No; not at all. I think you have answered my questions satisfactorily, to the extent that certain private utilities in the western section are developing, or are planning to develop, additional power in that area.

Now, I turn to another subject and ask you, just for the record, to tell us how well balanced the Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee is. I mean, how much private power is represented in the conference and how much public power is represented in the conference?

Mr. ERDAHL. The last sheet of our statement will indicate the individual. It will not indicate, however, the size——

Mr. EVINS. That is what I am speaking of.

Mr. ERDAHL. I will ask Mr. Delzel to answer that question.

Mr. DELZEL. Mr. Chairman, of the present pool you referred to, 7,500,000 kilowatts, slightly over that now, a little over 3½ million kilowatts are represented by——

Mr. EVINS (interposing). 3½ million?

Mr. DELZEL. Yes. And slightly under 3 million kilowatts by several electric companies; approximately 1,200,000 by the several municipal agencies, particularly the old-line agencies, such as Seattle, Tacoma, and Eugene, Oreg., which have their own generating facilities, largely.

Mr. EVINS. Now, when the Chief Joseph and the other dams that are proposed and underway are added to this group, how will the situation stack up at that time?

Mr. DELZEL. At the present time there are approximately 3 million kilowatts of construction underway.

Mr. EVINS. 3 million of construction underway?

Mr. DELZEL. Yes; the greater part of which is represented by McNary Dam and Chief Joseph at this juncture.

Mr. MCCLUNG. And The Dalles is the third.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. DELZEL. Yes; The Dalles. And of course, the other plants, for the figures I have referred to here, are the 4 or 5 private companies, what they have under consideration.

Mr. EVINS. Well, let us look at it for the time being for those under construction, and then we will add the planned.

With those under construction, underway, how will that affect it, what will be the total situation, when these projects are completed; approximately what will be the situation?

Mr. DELZEL. I would think by 1965, it would be about 50–50.

Mr. EVINS. But there is no——

Mr. DELZEL. That is about 6 million of non-Federal and 6 million plus, or minus——

Mr. EVINS. So there is no imbalance at the present time, or projected, on your economy?

Mr. DELZEL. No; the only imbalance at the moment would be that there is more Federal construction underway than actual non-Federal underway.

Mr. EVINS. With the Federal underway weighted for time?

Mr. DELZEL. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And what was constructed would still be——

Mr. ERDAHL (interposing). Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might make this suggestion because we want this to be as absolutely accurate as possible. We have the city of Tacoma coming in with a project that is actually under construction; we have the Priest Rapids project going forward by the Grant County PUD, not actually under construction, but there is preliminary engineering and they are spending a lot of money and I wonder if we might prepare a statement along that line including projects under construction and engineering being done, public and private, and match them up with the Federal and private under construction?

Mr. EVINS. Suppose you supply for the record, if you will, Mr. Erdahl, a statement showing the present situation with respect to public power and private power in the conference; and secondly, what the situation will be when present construction is completed and not include in that at this time the plans, or if you include plans, put that in sperately, for the Federal and private plans, but the second one would be under construction.

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes; included in that first group, you ask the question for contemplated plans, is for the city of Seattle, and I think if we had a little time to put those figures together, they could be made more accurate.

Mr. EVINS. Very well.

Mr. JONES. We have under construction now, a $26 million program——

Mr. EVINS. Under construction?

Mr. JONES. Yes; that will bring in about 140,000 kilowatts of energy in the next 3 years.

(The information requested follows:)

NON-FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

Project	Sponsor	Capacity
		Kilowatts
Box Canyon	Pend Oreille Public Utility District	60,000
Skagit	City of Seattle	120,000
Cowlitz	City of Tacoma	460,000
Velm	City of Centralia	5,000
Upper Clackamas	Portland General Electric Co	15,000
Total		660,000

NON-FEDERAL PROJECTS FOR WHICH PRELIMINARY PERMITS HAVE BEEN ISSUED BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, AND ON WHICH INVESTIGATIONS ARE IN PROGRESS

		Kilowatts
Priest Rapids [1]	Grant County Public Utility District	1,210,000
Rocky Reach [1]	Chelan County Public Utility District	585,000
Mountain Sheep	Pacific Northwest Power Co	250,000
Pleasant Valley	do	800,000
Bruces Eddy [1]	do	240,000
Upper Baker	Puget Sound Power & Light Co	80,000
Pelton-Round Butte	Portland General Electric Co	350,000
Noxon Rapids	The Washington Water Power Co	328,000
Upper Lewis	Pacific Power & Light Co	250,000
Beaver Marsh	City of Eugene	30,000
Boundary	City of Seattle	570,000
Total		3,693,000

PENDING LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS FOR JOINT ENDEAVORS BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL UTILITIES

		Kilowatts
John Day [2]	Participation would be open to any applicant	1,105,000
Cougar [3]	City of Eugene	39,000
Green Peter [3]	Pacific Power & Light Co	96,000

[1] Projects involve Federal participation.
[2] Readiness to finance entire power installation has been expressed by Portland General Electric, Pacific Power & Light, and Washington Water Power Cos.
[3] Sponsors listed have indicated intent to file for license if pending legislation is approved.

Mr. EVINS. There has been some indication to the committee that certain public power groups have pulled out from your conference. What is your statement with respect to that? If they have pulled out and are not associated with you at this time. Why are they out, in your judgment?

Mr. ERDAHL. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, there is any question of any public power groups pulling out. Earlier you had a statement of Mr. Tom Anderson, chairman of the Public Utilities Board of Tacoma, that they are in full support of our statement; and from the city of Seattle, we have a representative, Mr. Bob Jones, which includes the public agencies that have been represented on the Utility Conference Committee. In fact, we have a larger representation of individual and public utilities here this year than we have ever had in previous years.

Mr. JENSEN. I am very well pleased again to see all of you folks back before this committee, and to take note of your continuing unity and cooperation in this great job that you have to do to furnish sufficient power to the great Northwest. It was not always thus. But as you all know, I have always been a great believer in the fact that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

there is room for everyone and in the fact that Mr. Rayburn, our beloved Speaker once said before this committee, many years ago, "There are some folks that think that the Federal Government should own and control all of the power of America; there are some folks that think that private utilities should own and control all of the power of America." And the Speaker said, "I do not belong to either school. I believe there should be a partnership arrangement where all of the different groups should have their right to build power-plants and distribute power, and it certainly is going to take all of the money we can get from every source to produce and transmit sufficient power to carry on in this great electric age in a manner that will show the progress of America."

And I said, "Mr. Speaker, I belong to the same school."

And it was shortly after that that all of you folks of the Northwest, both in the Bonneville Power Administration and in the private utilities, municipalities, and the PUD's formed this fine, closely knit committee known as the Northwest Power Pool, and since that time you have been going along in a most commendable manner. The Congress has furnished the money for the projects, for Federal projects in that area, in about the full amount that you people requested it, and for which the Bonneville Power Administration has requested it, and I want to say again that I think it is a most commendable setup.

I have just a few questions.

What percentage of the farmers in your area are now served, are now receiving electric energy from any source, and it makes no difference, in sufficient quantities, or the quantities that they desire; can you tell us, the approximate percentage of the farmers who receive the power?

Mr. ERDAHL. I cannot answer that.

Mr. WEGNER. About 98 percent. In Oregon, it is 98.5 percent.

Mr. ERDAHL. In Oregon, 98.5 percent.

Mr. MCCLUNG. And in Washington, it is equally as high or higher.

Mr. JENSEN. You think Washington is about the same?

Mr. WEGNER. I believe you will find the report of the REA Administrator indicates that farms are about 98 or 99 percent electrified in Oregon and Washington and, I think, in Idaho.

Mr. JENSEN. That is a mighty fine record, and I presume you are going to continue to try to make it as near 100 percent as possible.

Now, is there any dissension among this Northwest Power Pool at this time; do you have any problems that you have not been able to resolve up to this time?

Mr. ERDAHL. I think the problem that was to be resolved, Mr. Jensen, is what part the Federal Government is going to play there in the future in the generating field and in the Northwest. Then once that is determined, I think between the public and the private utilities, individually, collectively, or collectively in cooperation, in many cases, with the Federal Government; there is no question but what our problem is going to be solved if that approach is made. You see, some of these projects out there have been authorized by the Congress for several years.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. ERDAHL. And we have been before the Congress on many occasions asking for Federal starts, and some have been started but others

have not. Now, many of the utilities, both public and private, have indicated a desire to join in a cooperative program to see that those projects are built so that we can have the kilowatts for the area for the need of continuing power in our area.

Mr. JENSEN. I know there are some controversial things in your area. I want to ask you this question, and I think Mr. Wegner, possibly, can answer it.

I will direct my question to you.

Mr. WEGNER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. In connection with the plans for future power supply in the region, the testimony was given to the effect that the Clearwater River, ruling out Libby and Canadian storage, for the present, offers the best possibility of the region for storage projects for power, and which, at the present time, will have greater flood-control effect on the lower Snake and Columbia Rivers, very much greater, than the High Hells Canyon in this respect.

Would you care to comment on that testimony, or what part local interests are prepared to take in the development of Clearwater.

Mr. WEGNER. If I understand all of your question, Mr. Jensen, I think I might comment on it this way: The question resolves itself, does it not, on the effect a dam on the Clearwater River will have with respect to flood control in the lower reaches of the river?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. WEGNER. I might answer the question this way: I happened the other day to sit in for about 30 or 40 minutes on the Senate hearing regarding the high Hells Canyon Dam. Mr. Fernald, of the Corps of Engineers, of Portland, was testifying, and gave figures as to the runoff and peak flows on the Snake River, the Salmon River, and the Clearwater River, all of which contributes to flows on the lower Columbia.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. WEGNER. In the instance of the 1948 flood, which was the one that caused extreme damage, the figures for that year showed that the Clearwater River made the greater contribution of those three rivers to that flood. I do not recall the figures that are in that report, but that is the point that Mr. Fernald was making.

Now, I may have answered the first part of your question. What was the other part?

Mr. JENSEN. I will just read the whole statement again: In connection with the plans for the future power supply of the region, testimony was given to the effect that the Clearwater River, ruling out Libby and Canadian storage for the present, offers the best possibility in the region for storage projects, for power, which, at the same time, will have greater flood-control effect on the lower Snake and Columbia Rivers, very much greater than the high Hells Canyon Dam in this respect. Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. WEGNER. I think I did answer as to the flood control. As to what possible plans there might be for the development of projects on the Clear Water River, mention has been made by Mr. McClung in his statement that four companies have formed the Pacific Northwest Power Co. for the purpose of constructing certain large projects.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. WEGNER. They have a permit for the investigation of a possible project at Bruces Eddy on the Clearwater River, which would

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

become a multipurpose project, and contribute to flood control, navigation, and power generation. That project would produce about 290,000 kilowatts, and would cost in the neighborhood of about $120 million total.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. WEGNER. It is under consideration. There are, however, very serious problems for a private, taxpaying utility, or any other local non-Federal utility—to construct such a project where the flood-control elements are such a substantial portion of the total cost, and not properly chargeable against power. That is the problem, basically.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not care particularly at this time to get into the Hells Canyon controversy. I have not taken any position on it at all to this date. Hearings have been held, as you know, in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Legislative Committee, on it.

Mr. WEGNER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. But, as I told some of the folks in the Reclamation Bureau the other day, that I did not suppose that we had the time to read all of those hearings and I said the only way we could find out or learn about it, or at least the best way we could learn about the controversy, whether or not high Hells Canyon Dam was the best way to handle the situation or not, or the way the power companies wanted to handle it, was to find out from the folks who are coming before this committee, the Army engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation engineers and what they thought about it.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. There is plenty of time to put it in the record.

Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. I gather from Mr. Wegner's response, he pointed up the flood-control features and desirabilities of a low dam, but he did not state that a high dam would provide the purposes of the multiple-purpose power production hydroelectric power, irrigation, and all-purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, that is on this river——

Mr. WEGNER. May I ask you a question, Mr. Jensen?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. WEGNER. Perhaps you misunderstood me. I was not commenting on the low dam. I thought Mr. Jensen asked what I could offer regarding a multipurpose power and flood-control project on the Clearwater.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, I am not going to try to get you fellows involved in that controversy today, I can assure you; there are plenty of people involved in it now, and possibly some of you folks have already taken a position on it; and that is your business, and as time goes on, we will learn more about it.

Mr. ERDAHL. I might suggest, Mr. Jensen, on that point for the clarification possibly of the committee, the chairman and the committee, that that particular controversy on the Hells Canyon project involves the Federal Government and the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. ERDAHL. The Idaho Power Co. being a member of what we call the east group of the Northwest power pool.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. ERDAHL. We are the west group.

Mr. JENSEN. I knew that. So that is a little out of your territory.

Mr. ERDAHL. Of course, on that one, we feel the same way; we hope somebody will get busy and build a project.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr ERDAHL. And get some kilowatts, which are really our main concern.

Mr. JENSEN. All of us want to get it done the right way.

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. The best way.

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. I will say to my colleague that the work that is being done in the Northwest area and in my section of Tennessee has resulted in great benefits to the farmers and to industry and to the people generally by having low rates and low-cost power for the development of those great sections of our country. The further you get away from the Northwest area, the higher the rates go throughout the Nation; and the same situation prevails with respect to the Tennessee Valley area, the further east, and the further distance you go, the higher the rates are shown on the distribution charts.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, Mr. Chairman, as you know, there is only one Columbia River; there is no river in the world that can produce power like the Columbia River; and of course, there is no other section of the country that has been favored quite the same way as you have in the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. EVINS. My colleague often refers to that favored spot in the country. As a matter of fact, having seen the operations of the Columbia River, the McNary, the Chief Joseph, and all of these projects, I am beginning to think that down in our area, we are quite small.

Mr. JENSEN. I am afraid that you are going to remain "quite small" unless you take private industry and private money into your fold.

Mr. EVINS. I want to say to the gentleman that there has been fine cooperation on the part of private utilities and public utilities in that area.

Mr. JENSEN. We have this between us most every day, folks. So do not think anything of it.

There are no better friends in the world.

Mr. EVINS. But the difficulty is that I have not been able to persuade him or convince him.

Mr. JENSEN. No. Both of us have a mind of our own, and that is what America is, with the privilege to speak out your own mind and finally we all come together and work for the good of the cause.

Mr. ERDAHL. I wonder if I might suggest for the benefit of the gentleman from Tennessee that the city of Tacoma's superintendent was one of the consulting engineers in Tennessee and used the benefit of his past experience from the city of Tacoma, and put in some of those same practices in your great area.

Mr. EVINS. I am sure the people are grateful and appreciative, and there is a community of interests, and, as I said earlier in the hearing, if I had not seen the gentleman and had his address identified as a Northwest area, located on the map, I would have taken his testimony as from the Tennessee Valley.

61653—55—pt. 2——27

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. JENSEN. He never misses a chance.

How much money do you anticipate will have to be spent in the Pacific Northwest, in this power-pool area, in the next 10 years, say, in order to supply sufficient power to the people in that area?

What do you anticipate will be needed because of the continual growth of population and industry in that area?

Mr. ERDAHL. About $3.5 billion.

Mr. JENSEN. For the power-pool area; for the next 10 years?

Mr. ERDAHL. Within 10 years.

Mr. JENSEN. $3.5 billion?

Mr. ERDAHL. $350 million a year.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Jensen, I believe he testified earlier that it would be about $350 million per year; each year, for either the Federal Government to supply that amount of money, or under a cooperative arrangement.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. That $350 million a year is more than we appropriate for the Bureau of Reclamation and that indicates, and I am sure that the Congress of the United States is not going to appropriate that much money. I can see where it behooves all of the different prower producing and transmitting concerns to use their utmost energies and capabilities in helping supply this power, along with the Federal Government.

Do you folks anticipate you can shoulder your fair share of this great responsibility, and get enough money; do you think utilities can furnish half of it?

Mr. DE LUCCIA. Mr. Chairman, the annual letter of transmittal of the Bonneville Power Administration for the year 1954, I believe, points out that 41 applications before the Federal Power Commission represent a total of 8 million kilowatts for licenses and preliminary permits, are being requested.

The amount of power shown in total for the next 10 years on that other side of the chart, not accounted for in blue, is about 3.5 million kilowatts. The indication is that both public and private feel they can get all the funds necessary to do the job, and certainly insofar as the private companies are concerned, the figures mentioned here by Mr. McClung indicate there can be raised something over $8 billion without any difficulty.

Mr. JENSEN. Fine.

Mr. ERDAHL. May I suggest, however, that that is going to call for some cooperation on the part of the Federal Government before they will spend that money on it.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, I think you can depend on that. We have cooperated pretty fully, have we not, up to date?

Mr. ERDAHL. I am not complaining, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to add that for some of those projects, they have been non-Federal private projects, utilities in that area, and the money would be spent because they have projects on which to spend that sum of money, some of which are authorized by the Congress at the present time, and would have to be deauthorized and entered in the form of cooperative programs, with non-Federal agencies, if that were done.

Could I put in the record at this point, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Jensen, the answer that I had from Colonel Foot with regard to the multipurpose project for the Corps of Engineers, which indicates

that for multipurpose projects for the entire United States, the annual appropriation is $286 million?

Mr. JENSEN. $286 million.

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. You are going to have to have an awful lot of steam generation to firm up, or to peak up, this hydroelectric power, are you not?

Mr. ERDAHL. I mentioned it, and I do not think you were in the room at the time, in answer to the chairman's question, that we have a task force made up of all of the generating, public and private, utilities in the area, working with the Corps of Engineers and the Bonneville Power Administration, and the State power commission, to determine just what the answer is to that question you have just asked, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. JENSEN. All right.

Mr. JONES. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the power commission, of the State of Washington, has a number of engineers working on the steam energy situation, with other utility engineers and we hope that very soon we will be able to come up with the answer to that question.

Mr. JENSEN. What do you use for steam generation? Do you use mostly oil?

Mr. JONES. Oil.

Mr. ERDAHL. Mostly oil.

Mr. JENSEN. Any natural gas?

Mr. JONES. Not as yet.

Mr. ERDAHL. Some hog fuel, some hog fuel, but I think very little hog fuel.

Mr. JENSEN. Well, bring me up to date. I never heard of hog fuel.

Mr. ERDAHL. Waste wood products.

Mr. MCCLUNG. Wood is crushed in a "hog," Mr. Jensen.

Mr. ERDAHL. But a very small percentage of hog fuel is being used; it is mostly oil.

Mr. DICKSON. Mr. Jensen, or Mr. Chairman, I believe you asked a question about the east-west division. This [indicating] is the western part of the State, which was referred to. It is lying here, and down in here [indicating]. There are a lot of these kilowatts that they are trying to develop in that area, and if we are stopped from developing them, we are going to be in the hole someplace, somewhere else. There is a big diversity in hydrology between this area and the west coast area [indicating]. However, in the west coast chain, and the further west you go, the more the characteristics of streamflow depend upon rainfall. But it occurs at a time when the Columbia River water is low, and the development of these west coast streams fit very well into the overall picture; and, to a certain extent, take the place of steam generation.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that right now there will be some of your valuable hydroelectric power lost because of the fact that you do not have enough steam generation to keep the peak up, and a constant flow of firm power. Are you not losing some of the value of your hydroelectric generation?

Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. Jensen, could I call on Mr. Ward who has made the preliminary studies, and who is managing director of the Washington State Power Commission, on that point?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. WARD. You have a shortage shown here on this chart of something over 1.5 million kilowatts of power. When the installations that are being built are completed, they will have provided, or will be able to provide, some power, for a part of the time, to take care of that load. The remainder of it has to be supplied by steam. That is the problem we are studying now.

You asked a few moments ago how much steam power would be required, and the amount is pretty easy to determine; the total amount required in 1963–64, unless some new hydroelectric projects are built, would be approximately 2 million kilowatts.

Some of the load could be dropped, because it is an interruptable load, maybe 400,000 kilowatts, and about 400,000 kilowatts of steam in the area, so that the remainder of that that would be needed would be about 1,200,000 kilowatts of steam.

The question we are concerned with is not the amount which is needed, but how can we demonstrate the feasibility of financing it and making it available with hydroelectric power that will be economical?

Mr. JENSEN. And that study is going on now?

Mr. WARD. That study is going on now.

Mr. EVINS. Then to summarize, the study is underway of the steam needs for the hydro that is not supplied presently; and, secondly, approximately $350 million each year is going to be needed, projected over the next 10 years, and this fund will either have to be supplied by appropriations from the Federal Government or legislation enacted, which is pending, to bring about a cooperative arrangement or some sort of partnership situation in this area.

If that legislation is not enacted, it is the testimony of you gentlemen, on which most of you, or all of you are in agreement, that to meet the peak loads, and demands of the growing area, approximately $350 million appropriation each year will be needed.

Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. Chairman, I might suggest that it is about $350 million a year—about—300 million a year initially and you can see from the chart that it goes up to about $400 million by 1964. It grows annually, year by year and for the 10 years will average about $350 million annually.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. WEGNER. May I state, Mr. Chairman, we urge that the appropriation this year be made adequate to keep the Federal projects on schedule at McNary, Chief Joseph and The Dalles, planning for John Day and that adequate appropriations be made for Bonneville.

Mr. EVINS. I understand that all of you gentlemen are in favor of the proposed appropriations?

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And that all of you are in agreement on that?

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And you have also been taking a look into the future?

Mr. ERDAHL. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. If there is nothing further, we thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you.

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1955.

COLUMBIA BASIN AND ROZA DIVISION OF YAKIMA PROJECT

WITNESSES

HON. HAL HOLMES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ROSS MORRIS, REPRESENTING THE LANDOWNERS OF THE ROZA UNIT, YAKIMA PROJECT

Mr. EVINS. The committee will now hear Congressman Holmes and the witnesses he wishes to present.

Mr. HOLMES. Just one witness today, Mr. Chairman, and then I would like to make a short statement, if I may.

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to hear you again, Congressman Holmes.

Mr. HOLMES. May I introduce to you Mr. Ross Morris, secretary of Roza Irrigation District, representing the landowners on the Roza unit, Yakima project.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I propose, if it is proper, to make my remarks very brief.

Mr. EVINS. It is not only proper but very appropriate at this late hour.

Mr. MORRIS. Our problem is that we have an amendatory repayment contract dated August 4, 1954, which is the result of several years of negotiations. The election which was held by the landowners was held on May 29, 1953. Congress has approved this contract. The President has signed it. We are operating under it, and all we have left to do is the construction of a powerplant.

Some $3 million of credits have been extended to the landowners and that $3 million is to be recovered from the sale of power from this proposed plant, which is more or less a Government situation, I think, but the landowners do come in from this view.

I have a statement here which was prepared by the power division of the Boise office of the Bureau of Reclamation which discloses that the cost to the landowners for power which was purchased from the Bonneville Power Administration for the season 1954 was 3.37 mills, and the cost of the power from the proposed plant is estimated at 2.75 mills. That is the thing that interests our landowners there, of which I am one. We are apprehensive that the Bonneville rate may go still higher because of the higher unit cost of the new dams in the power system that Bonneville has.

Therefore, we are requesting that an appropriation be made for a start on this plant in conformity with the changes that are set out in the contract, from the selfish viewpoint that we will be able to get power cheaper from this proposed plant than we are now able to get it.

I think that is the crux of the whole thing.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Morris. We appreciate your statement. The prepared material which you have submitted will be made a part of the record.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(The material referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY ROSS MORRIS, AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE LANDOWNERS ON THE ROZA UNIT, YAKIMA PROJECT, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

1. A Bureau of Reclamation engineering report, issued in 1932, outlined the construction plan for the Roza project, and provided for a main gravity canal with selected pumping areas above the main canal and provided for a powerplant to produce the pumping power.

2. A repayment contract between the Government and the landowners was entered into in December 1935. This contract provided for a power source and contemplated a powerplant and power canal.

3. An amendatory repayment contract, dated August 4, 1954, provides for the construction of a Roza powerplant (10,000 kilowatts), and extends discounts in the amount of $3,023,818 to the landowners. The only way this investment can be recovered by the Government is through the sale of power from this proposed powerplant. (See pp. 4 and 5 of contract.)

4. This contract of 1954 provides that the pumping power required for the project shall be reserved for and sold to the landowners. The surplus power, over and above the pumping requirements, is to be marketed by the Government through BPA. Power to lift water to the 27,000 acres, which are being irrigated by pumping, is presently being purchased from Bonneville Power Administration at a cost to the farmers for the year 1954, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, of 3.37 mills. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that the cost of pumping power from the proposed plant would be 2.75 mills. (This would represent a saving of 22 percent to the landowners.)

5. The Government already has an investment of some $3 million in the power canal and other features connected with power. The work remaining to be done is the construction of a penstock, some 1,500 feet in length, and the construction of the powerplant. The tailrace and all other facilities are completed, including the purchase of the land to be occupied.

6. The power water will be returned to the Yakima River and used for irrigation on projects located a few miles below the power site.

7. We are told that the Bureau of Reclamation can advantageously spend an initial allocation of $400,000 to construct the proposed plant.

8. The landowners of the Roza project respectfully request your consideration in this matter and urge that a proper allocation of funds be made for the construction of the proposed Roza powerplant.

ROZA

Water users' construction charges to be repaid from power revenues:

Lines and substations	$894,160
Canal enlargement	1,000,000
Subsidy	1,137,818
Total	[1] 3,031,978

[1] These amounts will not be recovered by the United States under terms of the Roza Irrigation District repayment contract unless the Roza powerplant is built.

Water users power bills

	With Roza	Present conditions
Cost of power	[1] $75,008	[2] $67,145
Operation and maintenance and replacement, lines and substations	0	24,750
Total	75,008	91,895
Cost, mills per kilowatt-hour	2.75	3.37

[1] 2.75 mills per kilowatt-hour applied to estimated calendar year 1954 usage at pumping plants (29,328,801 times 0.93).

[2] Actual bill for calendar year 1954 usage.

Mr. EVINS. I might state that earlier testimony brought to the attention of the committee that the Roza project was complete and that it was the intial plan and purpose to build a hydroelectric powerplant in connection with the dam. As I understand, a contract has been entered into with the water users anticipating that the power will help pay the load.

Mr. MORRIS. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. And that over $1 million has been spent for this purpose?

Mr. MORRIS. About $3 million. I have checked here the pertinent portions of this contract.

Mr. EVINS. Since the contract has been entered into, if the power is not provided as originally intended, what will be the ultimate effect?

Mr. MORRIS. I think there is a statutory provision that this contract could not specify when the plant would be constructed to bind some future Congress, but it is all clearly specified in detail as to what will be done and how every detail will be handled.

Mr. EVINS. In other words, the contract anticipates the power unit will be installed to help pay the load, and there is an implied contract that a power unit will be installed at this dam?

Mr. MORRIS. The power canal and irrigation canal are the same.

Mr. EVINS. Could you tell the committee how much money will be necessary to install the hydroelectric power facilities and complete the job?

Mr. MORRIS. I have no technical knowledge of that, but this contract states, I believe, $2.7 million.

Mr. EVINS. About $2.7 million?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And the power is needed in the area and could well be used?

Mr. MORRIS. There is a power shortage in the Northwest and the power that is not reserved for pumping, which is a summer operation, will go back on the Bonneville lines.

Mr. EVINS. The public would be benefited and the water users also?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

May I make one suggestion here. This [indicating] is a copy of the contract the landowners voted on. The actual current contract itself is at slight variance in language in a few places, but nothing changes the sense of the contract. Some lawyers made some little changes. No additional vote was necessary.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Morris. You have supplied the committee what in your estimate would be the ultimate cost?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. The Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, has estimated $400,000 could be used effectively in fiscal year 1956, and this statement prepared by the Department will be placed in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Yakima project, Roza division—Roza powerplant

Total estimated cost	$2,913,000
Total amount that could be used effectively in fiscal year 1956	400,000

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Morris, you have been before our committee before, have you not?

Mr. MORRIS. A good many years ago.

Mr. JENSEN. I remember you very well and I am glad to see you again.

When was the estimate on the cost of the powerplant made, do you remember?

Mr. MORRIS. The estimate that is in the contract would have been made in the summer of 1953.

Mr. JENSEN. 1953. That is the estimate that is in the contract now?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. $2.7 million?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Did the Bureau of Reclamation officials give you an estimate?

Mr. HOLMES. $2,913,000 was their estimate.

Mr. JENSEN. My only question is this: I am going to tell you frankly that it is impossible to build a hydroelectric powerplant and produce power except on the Columbia River, and they say it is getting impossible on the Columbia River, and sell power for 2.75 mills. Any engineer will tell you just that. I do not care who he is, whether he is a Bonneville engineer or a private engineer. They will all tell you that.

Now, the thing I want to ask is this: I do not want to be unfair about this thing at all. You have a great project out there, there is no question about it, and I was very happy to assist in appropriating the money necessary to complete your project. You have a project there where the water users will have no trouble paying off according to the contract you have made, because you can raise anything on that land if you get water on it. Mr. Holmes and I drove along the Roza River and on one side of the road was sagebrush, and the other side, which had looked exactly like the side with the sagebrush the year before, had fine crops of potatoes and other things growing just a year afterward right across the road. So I decided I would quit worrying about Roza. Just by putting water and land together you people are doing fine. Of course I have been a great advocate of irrigation projects on land of that kind.

Now, will the water users agree to repay the cost of this powerplant?

Mr. MORRIS. The terms are spelled out very carefully in that contract. Yes, we have to pay I think perhaps a higher rate until the powerplant has paid itself out, then we get a reduced rate after that.

Mr. JENSEN. You probably will have to pay 6 or 7 mills for a good many years. Do you not think so? It would not worry you to do that, would it?

Mr. MORRIS. Well, our farmers are no different than others. Money is scarce there, too.

Mr. JENSEN. It is, on the Roza project? Well, all right. How much is nonreimbursable on the Roza project, what percentage?

Mr. MORRIS. The amount is a little over $3 million.

Mr. JENSEN. And its overall cost is how much?

Mr. MORRIS. We are to pay $19.5 million. This $3 million was already taken off which brings it down to $19.5 million.

Mr. JENSEN. The water users are paying $19.5 million?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. So you have $19.5 million reimbursable and possibly $3 million nonreimbursable?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; charged to the powerplant.

Mr. JENSEN. Charged to the powerplant?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. There is a lot of commercial power there and we will be jointly involved there.

Mr. JENSEN. Your revenues outside of your Roza project, you anticipate, will amount to $3 million?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. In that event your whole project is reimbursable.

Mr. HOLMES. That is right, because we will pay off the powerplant.

Mr. JENSEN. Over how many years? What is the term of years on this project?

Mr. MORRIS. Approximately 65 years.

Mr. HOLMES. Between 63 and 65 years.

Mr. JENSEN. The justification shows the project to be fully reimbursable. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to develop that.

Mr. EVINS. I think it is proper that it be developed.

Mr. MORRIS. There is one point I did not bring out so clearly. The water in the canal is up this side of the hill; the land for the plant is already purchased; the tailrace to the river is in. The money has been spent for the tailrace and the power canal capacity and the transmission line, and the only missing link is just the powerplant itself with the pipeline to it.

Mr. EVINS. The farmers will pay for the power and from the proceeds of the sale of the power the project will be liquidated?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes. Our point is we would like to get the plant started because that way we will get power cheaper.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Holmes.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the budget request for the Columbia Basin is $12,500,000 to finance the fiscal year 1956 construction program on that famous project. These funds will be expended for the continuing of construction of irrigation facilities. During the fiscal year 1956 facilities to serve an additional 54,000 acres of new land will be completed. A major portion of the funds will be used for contracts for the extension of laterals and related facilities in all three of the irrigation areas. I urgently request the committee to grant these funds as requested in the budget. It is important that the Columbia Basin project move along in its development program.

The budget for the fiscal year 1956 includes $3 million for the continuation of construction of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project. This committee is very familiar with all the details concerning this project, its history, the necessity for its development, and the reasons why it came into being. There are certain members sitting here on the committee that remember full well when this project was started and took a personal interest in it. I urgently request that the committee continue its construcion on schedule by granting the full $3 million recommended and requested by the budget. First irrigation on this project is scheduled for late in the fiscal year, with facilities to serve some 6,700 acres being completed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The budget for the fiscal year 1956 includes $75,000 for the Roza division of the Yakima project. These funds are to be used primarily on advancement of the division drainage system. Investigations of a long-time plan will be active, and construction of minor drainage facilities in areas requiring immediate relief is scheduled. In addition a small amount of work will be done in revising the present warehouse to provide suitable space for the Roza Irrigation District. I urge the committee's allowance of these funds.

The Roza division was authorized on November 6, 1935, pursuant to the Fact Finders Act of December 5, 1924. Construction of this division began in 1936. The authorized plan from the start included construction of a powerplant at a power drop on the main canal. The first 11 miles of this main canal has been constructed at a capacity of 2,200 cubic feet per second which includes a capacity of 965 cubic feet per second specifically on the premise that the Roza powerplant of 11,250 kilowatts would be constructed.

The Roza division receives its water supply by means of pumping to levels above the main canal. The repayment plan for return of the construction cost to the Federal Government was based on the premise that this powerplant would be constructed so as to hold pumping cost for the Roza Irrigation District at an absolute minimum.

The amendatory repayment contract which was approved by the Congress and executed on August 4, 1954, specifically provides that in the event the Roza powerplant should not be constructed that the district would not be obligated to repay the $1 million of main canal cost attributable to the 965 cubic feet per second of capacity built in that canal specifically for power production; $886,620 of transmission facilities which had in the project plan been earmarked for payment from power revenues; and $1,137,818 of project cost allocated to irrigation but which had been expected to be paid from power revenues accruing from the Roza powerplant. Thus it is clear that if the Roza powerplant, the total estimated cost of which is $2,913,000, is not constructed in accordance with the basic authorization and approved plan for the Roza division, the Government will be foregoing the opportunity of recovering $3,024,438. If, on the other hand, the powerplant is constructed, the Federal Government will recover the full construction cost of the powerplant as well as the $3,024,438 of cost already incurred but assigned to power for repayment.

In response to my specific inquiry, the Bureau of Reclamation has informed me that the Bureau and the Department of the Interior requested in its budget request to the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1956 the amount of $386,000 to undertake construction of the Roza powerplant. With $386,000 to $400,000 the Bureau would be able to complete the design work, issue sepcifications, and award the prime construction contract as well as initial contracts, and make progress payments to furnish major equipment such as turbines, turbine governors, and generators.

It seems to me that it would be good business for the Federal Government to proceed now with dispatch to complete this project as originally planned and to make possible through the construction of this powerplant the return of $3,024,438 that would otherwise not be forthcoming.

It is my understanding that the operation and maintenance moneys necessary for the Columbia Basin have been recommended at $3,601,000. These funds are required to meet the expenses incident to the operation of the project and are necessary to do so efficiently.

For the fiscal year 1956 operation and maintenance program of the Yakima project, there is recommended $447,000. These funds are required to meet the expenses incident to the operation of that project. I am sure that the committee is aware of the wisdom of seeing to it that these operation and maintenance moneys are granted for such purposes.

The Fourth Congressional District of Washington, which I have the honor of representing, is the southeast portion of the service area of Bonneville Power Administration, and the funds requested for that area amount to $2,441,000. The funds required by the Bonneville Power Administration for the fiscal year 1956 are for the major grid transmission lines and secondary transmission facilities needed to meet the increased power requirements of utility and industrial customers. I am very much interested that these moneys be provided for purposes of Bonneville Power Administration and their program in that area.

It is my understanding that the budget recommendations for the Dalles Dam are $63,500,000. This dam is vitally necessary to be continued on construction program to meet the power needs of the Pacific Northwest. I urgently request that the budget recommendation be granted.

For McNary Dam there is a recommendation from the budget of $11 million. As this committee well knows, this dam is nearing completion and should be finished off as rapidly as possible, and these moneys are required to do just that.

While Chief Joseph Dam is not in my district, I strongly endorse the budget recommendation of $18 million.

With the construction of the Dalles Dam there comes the necessity of dislocating some Indian lands and rights behind the dam. This will require immediate rehabilitation and replacement of these original settlers. It is my understanding that the dislocation of many of these settlers will take place, according to the construction schedule of the Dalles Dam, this coming summer. The impact of the construction of the Dalles Dam upon these Indians leaves an obligation on the part of the Government for their rehabilitation, which will require an immediate appropriation of a minimum of $200,000. I understand that the Department of Interior has brought this matter to the attention of the committee, and I urgently request that such moneys be provided for the rehabilitation and relocation of the affected persons.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Holmes. I am tremendously impressed with your statement.

I have a statement on this project submitted by Congressman Don Magnuson. Congressman Holmes represents the district in which this project is located and Congressman Magnuson represents the State at large, as I understand it. Mr. Magnuson has sopken to me several times about this project and expressed his great interest in it. I would like his statement to be inserted in the record at tlfis point.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DON MAGNUSON

YAKIMA PROJECT, ROZA DIVISION, WASHINGTON

Mr. Chairman, I am here this afternoon to call the attention of the committee to the fact that there is no provision in the budget request for construction of a powerplant at the Roza division of the Yakima project in the State of Washington, which I represent as Congessman at large.

I believe this is a serious omission, and I respectfully ask this committee to add the funds necessary to construct the powerplant.

The irrigation facilities for the Roza division are complete. The only item in the budget is $75,000, $65,000 of which is to continue investigations and planning for a definite drainage plan on a projectwide basis, and the remaining $10,000 of which is for alterations to the present warehouse to provide office space for the Roza Irrigation District. Of course, I support this request.

The powerplant always has been contemplated as an essential part of the project. It has been designed to utilize a 165-foot drop from the Roza main canal back to the Yakima River. Already there have been constructed, to provide capacity for the future installation of the powerplant, a diversion dam, 10.9 miles of main canal, wasteway No. 2 headworks structure, and a tailrace to the Yakima River.

The proposed powerplant will provide 11,250 kilowatts of power. Two-thirds of this power will be used to operate the pumping plants of the project, and will replace power now being purchased from the Bonneville Power Administration for this purpose. Estimated saving in cost to the irrigation district is one-half a million The balance of the power will be sold commercially.

It is significant, Mr. Chairman, that the amendatory repayment contract with the Roza Irrigation District provides that over $3 million of the present cost of the project will be repaid from power revenues, in addition, of course, to the costs of the powerplant itself and the necessary transmission facilities.

In other words, the repayment contract cannot be carried out, and the Government will not be repaid this $3 million of money already expended, until the powerplant is installed.

The Roza division without a powerplant is like the headless horseman—the thing will function, but it's incomplete.

I understand that the regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation requested funds for the powerplant, but the request was not included in the budget.

It is estimated that the powerplant will cost $2,913,000. The Bureau has indicated that $386,000 is the amount which would be required in fiscal year 1956 to initiate construction.

I respectfully request, Mr. Chairman, that this amount be added to the appropriation for the Roza division.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you gentlemen.

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1955.

SOUTHERN SAN JOAQUIN MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT

WITNESSES

NORTHCUTT ELY, SPECIAL COUNSEL
BURT GREEN, SECRETARY-MANAGER
E. L. GLEICHNER, PRESIDENT

Mr. EVINS. We will hear next Mr. Northcutt Ely and a group with respect to the San Joaquin Valley.

I believe that you are going to entertain the committee with a showing of a film.

Mr. ELY. We think the film will be more instructive than entertaining.

My name is Northcutt Ely. I am an attorney, with offices in the Tower Building, Washington, D. C. I am special counsel for the Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District, of Delano, Calif., located about 30 miles north of Bakersfield.

The witnesses today will be Mr. E. L. Gleichner, the president of the board of directors of that district, and Mr. Burt Green, the general manager.

The problem that we are bringing to you is not at the moment a request for money, but to report to you upon what has happened to the money you have already appropriated in the past.

The motion picture will show a portion of the distribution system built by the Bureau of Reclamation which carries Central Valley water to the lands of our farmers. The first unit of this distribution system, and a part of the second unit, are in a totally unacceptable condition due to leaks.

The Bureau of Reclamation has served notice upon the district, nevertheless, that it will be required to take over the operation, maintenance and repair of this line, which you are about to see, effective as of May 2 of this week.

We have had up with the Bureau of Reclamation and with Secretary Aandahl the necessity for replacing this bad line with a workable line. We are hopeful that a solution will be reached shortly. It has to be reached soon so that the work can be done after the end of the present irrigation system. It may be that these negotiations will come to a head before the bill before you is finally enacted, and there consequently may be language offered on the Senate side. It is premature for us to attempt to offer language for the bill itself here today. But because the matter may come to a head after the bill has left your hands, we are taking the liberty of showing you the pictures so that if it comes back to your hands a month from now you will know about it.

I will ask Mr. Green to explain the motion pictures.

Mr. GREEN. My name is Burt Green and I am secretary-manager of the Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District.

With your permission I would like to show to you these pictures that will show the condition of the lines constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

This particular unit [showing picture] was completed in 1951. These pictures were taken in March 1955. I have a complete historical record by pictures, year by year, similar to this.

In the early stages it was worse than this, though it is still very bad right now. It is so bad we do not feel we can live with it. This is all caused by leaks. You will notice the ground between the vines is dry. There is no irrigation water here at all. It is all caused by the leaks in the system.

Our contract was signed March 13, 1948, for a distribution system with the Bureau of Reclamation, and they in turn let contracts for portions or units of this construction. We first used these lines in April 1951. We were unable to use them for the month of March and up to April 21 of that year because of the enormous number of leaks in the lines causing hazardous conditions for driving along county roads.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

On April 21, 1951, we first ran water through these lines, and from that day on we have realized that this type of construction was not adequate for our purposes.

During almost the entire period from that time until now we have had a condition such as this every spring, lasting anywhere from 6 to as much as 120 days or more.

There are approximately 31 miles of mortar joint lines in this unit. All the trouble developed in the mortar joint lines and we realized early that something had to be done about that.

As you can see in this movie, the stream of water coming from the leaks makes the road hazardous for driving. At the same time it becomes almost impossible for the farmers to work their ground.

These particular lines in this portion of the picture all serve the vineyards. Those people require quite a bit of water and quite a bit of cultivation. Due to conditions such as they they are unable to work their ground. At times this water, as you can see, almost stops people from getting into their homes, causing mud conditions, and that is bad, as well as the hazard of driving.

We notified the Bureau of Reclamation early in 1951 we thought something should be done about this; that another look at the construction should be given because it was clearly evident that this would not serve our purpose.

It finally came to the point where we asked for a public hearing with the water problem committee in California. This was held in April 1952.

At that meeting, many top level Bureau engineers gave us assurances that we would not be asked to accept this system in this condition; in fact, they would not accept it themselves, and the contractor would be forced to make this a reasonably tight irrigation system. But during the spring of 1952 the condition continued, even after that public hearing, and many, many letters were written to Congressmen, Senators, and others in the Bureau of Reclamation about this condition, with the hope some solution could be found. We were told by the Bureau of Reclamation that they were sure these lines would be adequate after constant repair.

The movie shows you conditions in the fifth year of operation. Constant repair has not done what they said it would do, or hoped it would do. There have been around 5,000 leaks repaired in this portion of the system up to 1955. This portion of the system comprises less than one-third of the entire construction.

The 31 miles of mortar joint line is what we are having trouble with. In two-thirds of the line, where the rubber-gasket type was substituted for the mortar-joint line, we only had 58 active leaks as of March 28 of this year, whereas in one-third of the system, having mortar joints, we had 323 active leaks as of March 28.

These pictures here show surfaced roads through most of this area, and there is quite a bit of travel upon them. On the surface the school buses have been traveling, we have been fearful, right from the beginning that a serious accident might occur which would involve the district, but there has been but one accident. A car overturned, but fortunately no one was seriously injured.

This portion here where you see a lot of water, just 1 large pond, but there may be as many as 20 leaks in that area. Not to overemphasize, we count that pond as just one leak.

Here is shown a field ready for planting. The water has run down several of the roads. We have backed up the dirt around the leaks and turned it into a ditch that the farmer built for us there to keep the water off the road. We had to turn that line off because other farmers in that area just could not operate. They could not work their farms at all and this farmer had to get in and dry up the land so he could work it. That happens quite often when these leaks become that bad. We have to shut that line down entirely.

What makes this particularly bad with us is that prior to March 1 of each year we must order the entire year's supply of water from the Bureau of Reclamation and pay for it, and then if your lines are shut down for 30 days, which in some instances they have been, waiting for a repair crew, that is not one-twelfth, as you might think, of the water that the farmer could use, that could mean for that 1 month, March or April, as much as one-third of his whole year's water.

The provision of our contract is that if we cannot use the water we pay for it anyway, so the farmer will lose lose not only some money but the water.

What makes it additionally bad is that the farmer has to pay a standby charge for his pump in order to produce his own water to irrigate, and in instances that runs $300 to $1,000 just for irrigation that we are unable to give him.

This picture shows a dry spot, but it indicates a wide area where water has been, and holes have been dug preparatory to repair. We feel with conditions such as this it is not only the dollars and cents value represented by this construction—that is bad—but there is also the danger during the spring from these open holes, as well as the potential loss of money and water to the farmer, and the inconvenience of everyone having to live with a situation such as this.

This picture shows the way a repair is made. They calked that joint with a lead wool and tried to dry it up entirely, and afterward they will band it with cement.

As you can see here, in portions where these leaks are and the water is, children have been playing over these holes, and that is also very dangerous because in almost all instances these lines run through areas of residences. In the district just to the north of us last fall a child fell into a hole similar to this one and drowned.

We have tried to keep up with these excavations with barricades and lights, but it is almost impossible. The number of leaks will indicate to you the size of a repair crew that our district would have to have.

The contractor, with all of his enormous facilities, cannot begin to keep up with this situation. He has never been able to yet, and he has had as many as 31 men on a repair crew, as well as upwards of $100,000 in equipment. If he cannot do it with his resources, I do not see how our district can ever hope to cope with it.

This picture here shows a more or less well-traveled roadway. It is right close to a town.

This picture shows a field where the farmer is having difficulty getting his crops planted. Water next to the roadway like this is always dangerous. The farmer cannot come out on the side to turn his equipment around. If he tries it he bogs down and he has call for help to get the equipment out of the mud.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The loss of water, while it might appear to be enormous from these pictures, is not an item of moment. We are very glad to assume anything like that if it is necessary. We do not think it is necessary. We are glad to assume the financial loss in paying for the wasted water if it will help correct the situation. So far there has been absolutely nothing that anyone has been able to develop to correct it, year after year, after year, every spring.

This picture shows a farm ready for planting. In this instance he is ready for irrigation. This is a grainfield and you will see this water has covered a great portion of the field. If that water stays there—and there is no way to get it out—that portion of the field will be destroyed. This man has complained of this situation often. He complained 5 years ago. Four years ago he attended the public hearing at Delano about the condition of the line, and each year he comes into the office and threatens with a suit unless we do something about it.

This picture shows the designation of a line, and the date the pictures were taken.

This picture shows a new planting of alfalfa. That whole corner of the field will be destroyed.

This picture shows a drainage of the water from both north and south into this sump, and the farmer reuses that for irrigation, but there is no water shown here that has been put in, other than the leak water from both the north and the south of his field. That shows 19 inches of water in that sump.

That concludes our moving pictures.

Mr. ELY. May I introduce Mr. E. L. Gleichner, the president of the board of directors?

Mr. GLEICHNER. The pictures will speak for themselves. Mr. Green has given you a rundown on the history of the district through the last 5 years.

I am president of the district at the present time, a landowner and a farmer. I can certainly appreciate the plight that these farmers are in. Fortunately, my farm is located on some of the later construction and we have the rubber joint type adjacent to my land.

We of the district feel we cannot live and work with those lines. We have attempted it for a period of 5 years now and we are making an effort to arrive at some permanent solution to this problem. We feel the replacement of these lines with a rubber gasket line similar to what we have in the other two-thirds of our laterals will do the job.

When Mr. Green said we have approximately 31 miles of these lines, he was referring to the sublaterals. We have approximately 160 miles of pipe in our system, if I am correct, and I believe that is right. About 100 miles are sublaterals, or smaller lines branching off from the large distributing lines. These sublaterals are the ones that we are having the trouble with. Our large lines are doing a wonderful job. They are all rubber gasket lines.

As I stated before, the last two-thirds of our sublaterals are rubber gasket lines. We were eventually forced in our opinion to ask the Bureau to halt construction on these sublaterals and possibly make a change to something better because we could not see operating the system with lines as you have been shown in these pictures.

Now, we are out for a solution. We think that replacing the lines which have caused trouble is the only solution to our problem. We are

here because we think possibly money might have to be appropriated eventually to correct the situation. We hope not, but that is our feeling.

Mr. EVINS. I think that I can speak for the other members of the committee when I say that it appears somebody has not done the job right. The job of this committee is to appropriate the money to the Bureau of Reclamation, and we have done that and are doing that annually.

Whose responsibility was this—the Bureau of Reclamation, the district, the farmers, or the contractor? Where does the responsibility lie? That is what you should determine to solve the problem. The water is leaking. The water is wasting away in many instances, and sometimes water is being diverted onto a farmer's land when he does not wish it. We have appropriated the money. You have the job of administration and carrying the job out. Whose responsibility is it to see that the contractors build the proper type of canals?

Mr. ELY. If I might respond to your question, on April 7 of this year the chief engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation in making a final settlement with the contractor made certain findings of fact. The contractor had come up for payment for a number of these leaks, many hundreds of them. The Bureau and the chief engineer, in making that finding of fact, held the contractor to be responsible for roughly half of the leaks, because of bad workmanship, and apparently accepted the responsibility of the Bureau for roughly half.

The finding is in paragraph 8. The text is contained in our statement at the conclusion of our testimony. It says that there have been many different views and opinions expressed by parties who have made investigations for the Government, the contractor and the irrigation district, as to the causes of the unusually high number of leaks in the mortar joint lines constructed in this system. These causes include poor workmanship, adverse thermal conditions, unstable foundations, unsuitable mortar governed by specifications——

Mr. EVINS. Do you not think it is the responsibility of the legal officers in the Bureau of Reclamation to draw these contracts so as to protect the Government's interest, and if the contractor accepts the job and money, do you not think he should certainly do a good job and live up to the contract?

In the first place, the Bureau of Reclamation ought to draw the contract properly, in my opinion, so tight that if the contractor does not do a good job he would not be paid.

Mr. ELY. I agree with you.

Mr. EVINS. That is really not a matter that should be brought to this committee. It is all right for the committee to be informed about it, but it is an administrative problem, as I see it.

Mr. ELY. You are right. The difficulty so far as we are concerned is that we are caught between them. The district has no power or control over the matter. The contractor claims the Bureau drew bad specifications and the Government claims the contractor did bad work. We want the work replaced by lines that will work, regardless of whose fault it is. We are hopeful that the Bureau will see that necessity and replace these lines with rubber gaskets. We do not feel that it is the responsibility of the district.

61653—55—pt. 2——28

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I would like, with your permission, to place in the record a statement which will summarize some of this correspondence and the specifications and so forth.

Mr. EVINS. Permission is granted.

(The statement referred to appears at the conclusion of the testimony.)

Mr. MURRAY. Who prepares the specifications for these lines?

Mr. ELY. The Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. MURRAY. Was there any reason why the rubber joints were inserted into the contract after the original contract was entered into?

Mr. ELY. As I understand it, after 31 miles of the mortar-joint pipe nad been laid and its was apparent that it was not going to work, the district requested the Bureau to stop. In the meantime, some rubber-gasket lines had been laid and were doing well. That was in the larger size. This trouble has been happening in pipe 24 inches and under. The bigger pipe is holding up very well. After this 31 miles was laid, the Bureau switched over to rubber-gasket pipe for all sizes and it has worked very well.

Mr. MURRAY. In your opinion, was it because of bad specifications, or inadequate workmanship?

Mr. ELY. Apparently both. Consulting engineers were appointed by the Bureau and the district to try to unravel that problem, but without any conclusive answer. The best answer that we seem to be able to get is that the specifications were bad with respect to the conditions that would control the laying of the smaller size pipe, and, in addition, the contractor did not do a good job of it, apparently. In any event, we are caught with a system that you saw on the screen. The findings of fact seem to support that.

The Bureau of Reclamation apparently recognized responsibility for about half of the cost of the repairs and required the contractor to pick up half.

Mr. MURRAY. In other words, am I correct in assuming the actual cause of this condition has not been finally determined?

Mr. ELY. The Chief Engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation has determined it, in a sense, by determining financial responsibility as between the Bureau and the contractor. The physical cause for it, as the finding of fact indicates, remains in some dispute. Apparently what has happened is that the larger size pipe was laid with proper provision for curing; they were laid when wet and were required to be kept wet. The smaller sizes were not. The smaller sizes kept on breaking.

The Bureau says that the joints were not properly made by the contractor, in the first place, but not only have joints broken, but the pipe itself.

The end conclusion seems to be that you cannot do anything with this pipe in its present condition to ever put it in a permanent workable condition. It is going to keep on breaking, apparently, because of the conditions under which it was laid.

Mr. MURRAY. Here you have a serious question where you have 31 miles of pipe that has been, from your testimony, just a waste of money. It is a waste of money resulting from somebody's neglect or fault. It is either the fault of the Government or of some private individual. I think that before an appropriation should be made to

correct the situation the responsibility should be finally determined.

Mr. ELY. As I say, we are caught between them.

Mr. MURRAY. I understand your position.

Mr. ELY. It is not our fault. Our farmers have the fields on which these leaks occur. We have a contract made with the Government in 1948, and the Bureau of Reclamation is the prime contractor, in our viewpoint. We undertook to repay the cost. We have a job that is not workable and not acceptable. The Bureau, nevertheless, demanded that we take over operation and maintenance of these lines that you have seen in the picture on May 2 of this week, and we cannot do it.

Mr. MURRAY. Assuming that we appropriated the money to tear up the 31 miles and put in pipes that would do the job, would not that be in effect fixing the responsibility for this condition on the Federal Government?

Mr. ELY. We do not know. We think that is where it should rest, upon the Bureau. Nevertheless, as Mr. Gleichner has indicated, and Mr. Green, to the Bureau of Reclamation, we do not yet have from the Bureau of Reclamation a final accounting upon the money spent to date.

Our contract liability is $9,900,000. The Bureau has not spent all that. The degree to which the district and the Bureau should participate in the liability or the burden to the extent of the unspent money is something that we can negotiate with them. As to appropriations, we have no breakdown of the item for distribution works in the current budget, but wherever the ultimate responsibility must rest, the money has to be spent for the replacement of the lines. If it should develop there is not money enough in the distribution line item of the Central Valley appropriation in the budget before you, then when we are able to get the facts we may have to request an increase in that item to cover this replacement. We understand that the appropriated fees distribution systems construction for fiscal year 1955 was $9,670,677 and for 1956 is budgeted at $5,246,843.

Mr. HAND. You are filing a bill of interpleader.

Mr. ELY. In effect, yes.

Mr. HAND. You do not care whose fault it is; you know it is not the fault of the district?

Mr. ELY. Exactly.

Mr. HAND. How did this come about, this settlement of the Chief Engineer in saying that "half of the leaks are your fault and half are ours?" Was that an arbitrary compromise, or was it based upon any actual calculations?

Mr. ELY. We were not permitted to participate in the negotiations and I cannot say. I would assume that it was to some degree a compromise.

The line was built in 1951, and it proved bad at once. The word got around early in 1952 that the Bureau was going to accept the line anyhow and our people were up in arms. As a matter of fact, the Bureau permitted or told the contractor to run horse manure in the water on the theory that the stuff would clog up these leaks long enough for the cement to heal itself by calcifying. This, for a while, was the celebrated "horse manure case," that attracted quite a bit of attention.

The Legislature of California sent a committee down to investigate the whole thing. That hearing was held on April 28, 1952. The horse

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

manure had been flowing through the pipes. The leaks continued. At that meeting the top brass of the Bureau of Reclamation appeared and told the district to relax; that they were not going to accept the lines from the contractor, that they were in terrible shape. On May 1, 1952, the Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation wrote Senator Knowland to that effect, but on May 2 they did accept the lines from the contractor.

Mr. HAND. What year?

Mr. ELY. 1952, 3 years ago. One provision of the contract entitled the contractor to tender these lines, if they would hold water for 15 days under test, but he elected not to make the test. He tendered them, instead, under another clause that allowed him to do so without test if he would warrant them against leaks for 3 years. The 3 years expired last Monday, May 2, 1955. During that interval the Bureau gave repeated assurances to members of the California congressional delegation that it would not release the contractor without proper performance of these warranties.

Mr. HAND. Did he warrant pipes against leaks for 3 years?

Mr. ELY. Yes.

Mr. HAND. And they were leaking during those three years?

Mr. ELY. Yes. He repaired at least 5,000 leaks.

Mr. HAND. But the whole line kept on leaking, these 31 miles?

Mr. ELY. Yes.

Mr. HAND. The contractor must have had a bond with his contract.

Mr. ELY. I cannot say.

Mr. HAND. You would suppose so?

Mr. ELY. I would suppose so.

On April 7, 1955, less than a month ago, the Bureau of Reclamation in a formal finding of fact, agreed with the contractor on a division of responsibility for the leaks, and accepted the line. They turned him loose. On April 18, 1955, they wrote our district saying as of this same magic date, May 2, 1955, the responsibility for the operation, maintenance, and repair would pass to us. That is what brings us here.

Mr. HAND. The situation is that either the specifications were bad or else the work was bad, or a combination of both. You have a contractor who has warranted the line against leaks for 3 years during which time it has been leaking, notwithstanding the warranty, and notwithstanding that the Bureau has made some settlement, and arbitrarily compromised arrangements by which they have said that about half the leaks were his fault and half are theirs, and they would settle on that basis?

Mr. ELY. Right.

Mr. HAND. And now they are turning the line over in the condition it is, and has been, to the district and saying that from now on it is your baby?

Mr. ELY. And we are saying to them, we cannot accept it.

Mr. HAND. Is all of the difficulty within the first 31 miles constructed?

Mr. ELY. Mostly.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. HAND. Has a mortar joint used in pipeline construction been used before and found satisfactory?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. The farmers have hundreds of miles of the same type of construction exactly, and they have very little difficulty with it. In fact, the pipe contractors around there figure that five leaks to the mile, when the line is first laid, is not out of reason. It is a good line even with five initial leaks to the mile.

Mr. HAND. That would be a bad idea with an oil pipeline or a natural gas pipeline.

Mr. ELY. At times we have had leaks every 46 feet in these lines.

Mr. HAND. I am not a pipeline contractor, but I do not see any sense in that many leaks, or even five to the mile.

What is the status of your water contracts and water payments?

Mr. GREEN. Our water service contracts call for a total of 147,000 acre-feet yearly, $2.50 for class 1 water and $1.50 for class 2.

Mr. HAND. And they have paid since the installation of the line?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. We have ordered yearly a quantity of water to take care of our needs, and we have paid for that in advance.

Mr. HAND. The district is right up to date?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. I am speaking of our water purchase contract payments are not yet due under our repayment contract on the distribution system.

Mr. EVIN. Thank you.

(Formal statement and exhibits accompanying testimony of Messrs. Gleichner, Green, and Ely are as follows:)

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE SOUTHERN SAN JOAQUIN MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT PRESENTED BY E. L. GLEICHNER, PRESIDENT, AND BURT GREEN, SECRETARY-MANAGER, ACCOMPANIED BY NORTHCUTT ELY, SPECIAL COUNSEL

Portions of units 1 and 2, consisting of 31 miles of mortar-joint pipelines of the water distribution system of the Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District, constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation pursuant to a repayment contract with the district dated May 13, 1948, are in a thoroughly unacceptable condition, incomplete, and not ready for satisfactory operation because of more that 300 active leaks in the 31 miles as of March 28, 1955. These leaks still exist despite the fact that more than 5,000 leaks have been patched and repaired in the 31 miles of line prior to this year.

The water escaping from leaky pipes constitutes an intolerable condition, hazardous to the physical well-being of the people in the locality as well as to their property and the escaped water seriously interferes with farming operations in the area.

The district and its farmers are required to pay the Bureau of Reclamation in advance for water they order, which could cause considerable financial loss to the farmers if the leaky pipes prevent delivery of their water.

Responsible officials of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation have repeatedly acknowledged the unacceptable condition of the distribution system and have given repeated assurances that the district would not have to accept responsibility for any portion of the system until it was completed and ready for satisfactory operation. Such assurances were made by the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in a letter to Senator Knowland dated June 8, 1953, by Mr. Goodrich Lineweaver, then Acting Commissioner of Reclamation, in a letter to Senator Knowland, dated May 1, 1952, and a letter to Congressman Engle dated May 2, 1952, and by other Bureau of Reclamation officials on other occasions.

On May 2, 1952, the Bureau of Reclamation accepted unit I from its contractor, subject only to the contractor's 3-year warranty of repair, notwithstanding the assurances by responsible Bureau officials as late as April 28, May 1 and 2, 1952, that none of the lines would be accepted from the contractor until they were free of leaks and notwithstanding that paragraph 75 (a) of specification No. 2893 provides expressly that the Government shall make final acceptance of the contractor's work only when a section of the pipeline "has been completed and

is reasonably free of leaks and ready for use as determined by the contracting officer."

On April 7, 1955, the Chief Engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation made findings of fact as to the contractor's and the Bureau's respective responsibilities for the defective pipelinees, in which he found, with the concurrence of the contractor:

"8. There have been many different views and opinions expressed by parties who have made investigations for the Government, the contractor, and the irrigation district, as to the causes for the unusually high number of leaks in hte mortar-joint lines construction in this system. These causes include poor workmanship, tion district, as to the causes for the unusually high number of leaks in the mortar-governed by specifications, porous areas in the pipe shell, pipe laying in hot weather, unsatisfactory backfill, lack of proper protection of lines after laying, differential settlement, and lack of end restraint. It is logical to assume that some leaks in the system could be attributable to any one or a combination of two or more of these causes. Under the guaranty provisions of paragraph 77 (b), the contractor is responsible only for leaks that were due to defects in workmanship or in materials furnished by the contractor. Leaks resulting from other causes would be the responsibility of the Government."

In a letter to the Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District dated April 18, 1955, W. W. Brenner, projects construction engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation at Lindsay, Calif., stated:

"The 3-year guaranty period for unit 1, lateral 119.6W and lateral 122.5W and the sublaterals expires May 2, 1955. After this date, the district will be expected to assume responsiblity for repair of pipelines as provided in the January 3, 1955, letter of agreement."

Mr. Brenner so informed the district notwithstanding the repeated assurances by responsible officials of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation that the district would not have to accept responsibilty for the system until it was reasonably free of leaks, and notwithstanding that the Bureau has not yet provided an adequate distribution system as it is required to provide by the basic repayment contract with the district of May 13, 1948.

The only permanent solution to the problem is to rip out all the unsatisfactory work and replace it with lines having rubber-gasket joints (which have been used with success on two-thirds of the southern San Joaquin distribution system).

It has been suggested to Hon. Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, that Mr. Brenner's letter of April 18, 1955, be rescinded immediately, and that the Bureau of Reclamation continue to repair the leaks by its own arrangement with the contractor, paying for the repairs out of construction funds. We have asked that the Bureau replace the unsatisfactory work with lines having rubber-gasket joints, and to begin planning this construction as soon as possible so that the work may commence immediately after the present irrigation season.

In the event that this requires an increase of appropriations or an earmarking of funds contained in the appropriation bill now before you, with reference to the Central Valley project distribution systems item, we will ask your cooperation to bring that about. The figures are not yet available but, with the Bureau's cooperation, they should become available before the Senate concludes with the bill.

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF R. K. DURANT, CONSTRUCTION ENGINEER OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, BEFORE THE MEETING OF THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE ON WATER PROBLEMS, CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE, DELANO, CALIF., APRIL 28, 1952

"As these units are completed and when the work on the lines put into operation is found to be satisfactory the system then will be turned over to the district for their use. It must be repeated, and district directors have been advised many times by the Bureau, that the distribution system will not be turned over to them until it is satisfactory.

"The United States has not accepted any portion of the work performed, nor has the district at any time been requested to accept or assume responsibility for any of the work completed or put into operation. Such assurances were given by the manager of the district, by the Chief Engineer of the Bureau, at a conference in the Bureau's office in Denver, Colo., on January 16, 1952.

"On November 30, 1951, Mr. Jack Rodner, district manager for the Bureau, wrote to the district:

" 'Mr. Boke has asked me to state most emphatically and unequivocally that until it is sufficiently established that the distribution system meets with the

specifications of the construction contract, it will not be accepted from the contractor, and, further, the use of the system during the current period does not constitute an acceptance by the United States or the district. The development period will not commence to run until the system has been completed satisfactorily.'

"On April 4, 1952, Mr. L. M. McClelland, Chief Engineer of the Bureau, wrote to the district manager:

"'Your letter of March 26, 1952, expresses apprehension as to whether the Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District will receive a good, usable pipe distribution system. The contracts under which the distribution system is being constructed provide just such a system and Bureau intends that the requirements of these contracts will be met.'

"The Federal Government is constructing the Southern San Joaquin Municipal District. All factors of type, design, and layout have been continuously under discussion with the district before the repayment contract was entered and since. The district wishes have been followed.

"In the interest of speed and economy the Bureau has welcomed and utilized the best obtainable advice of the concrete-pipe industry throughout the Nation in addition to the Bureau's own knowledge gained through successful design and construction of approximately 400 miles of concrete pipeline during the past 4 years.

"Leaks which have developed in a portion of the system are vexatious, troublesome, and certainly unwelcome, but they involve only a relatively minor part of the work, and they are being successfully repaired.

"The Bureau of Reclamation will comply in every respect with all of the terms of the repayment contract. The Bureau is fully cognizant of the responsibility imposed upon it by the Congress and that responsibility extends not only to the taxpayers and the citizens of the United States, but to the districts with which it seeks to cooperate in bringing water to the land. It proposes to exercise this responsibility with integrity, and generally that completes my statement." Transcript, pages 123–25.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C. May 1, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: By your letter of April 15, in regard to the leakage problem on the distribution systems being constructed for the Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District, and your personal inquiry during the course of the appropriation hearings today, you indicated your desire to be informed regarding this matter and also receive a copy of any reply which we may have sent the district. The district brought this problem to our attention sometime ago, and Chief Engineer McClellan has just returned to Denver from a conference with the district and construction contractor, United Concrete Pipe Corp. Copies of correspondence between the district, the chief engineer, and the regional office, have received our attention.

As you are probably aware, the situation with respect to the distribution systems in the San Joaquin Valley has been a matter of considerable concern. Mr. Green, the manager for the district, has been very alert in bringing all problems to our attention and has frequently consulted with our chief engineer, regional officials, and construction people. In addition, the district has secured the services of independent consulting engineers to consider the problems involved.

In the letter Mr. Green sent to Construction Engineer Durant of March 26, he took particular exception to the methods being used by the contractor to arrest the leaks in portions of the system and alleged that they amounted to fraudulent practice. Such allegation disturbs us, because Mr. Green did not object to the use of these methods at the time they were proposed.

There are now 3 contracts in force for each of the 3 units in the district. While all of the pipe in unit 1 has been in place for about a year, none of the lines have been accepted by the Government because of the unusual amount of leakage, mostly in the smaller pipe sizes where cement and mortar joints were used. The matter of responsibility for such leaks has been the subject of controversy for some time. The Government holds that the contractor is responsible for the leaks, primarily due to faulty workmanship, whereas the contractor

has alleged faulty design, poor bedding material, temperature differential, and other causes.

The Government has advised both the district and contractor that none of the lines will be accepted until a system free of leaks is provided. The contractor, Mr. Green, and members of the chief engineer's staff met on January 16 in Denver, Colo., at which time this question was thoroughly discussed and the Government's position was firmly established. At that time the use of organic matter in the pipe to reduce the leakage was discussed and no objections were raised. Since that time the contractor has been using organic matter in the pipeline for testing operations. Although the chief engineer did not believe that this method would to any great extent correct the leakage problem, he saw no reason to object to the procedure, as such method has been known to reduce or stop leakage in pipelines. At the same meeting, in the presence of Mr. Green, the contractor was advised that prior to final tests, any lines in which the organic material had been used must be thoroughly flushed out and drained. Mr. Green was also advised by the independent consulting engineers that the contractor had not fully complied with the specifications, and that the leaks were the result of faulty workmanship in the mortar type joints. This coincides with our conclusion that it is the responsibility of the contractor to correct such deficiencies.

In view of the position of the Bureau of Reclamation, we are at a loss to understand Mr. Green's continuing concern, since none of the lines have as yet been accepted by the Government and, of course, the district has not been requested to assume any responsibility for the work performed. *All of the Bureau's contracts require that good, usable, pipe distribution systems be furnished and it is our intention that these requirements be met before the systems are accepted and turned over to the district for its operation.*

As a result of the above-mentioned conference, we believe the concern as expressed by Mr. Green in his letter to Mr. Durant about the immediate problem and the Bureau's attitude should be allayed. We are in touch with this situation and will keep you currently advised.

Sincerely yours,

G. W. LINEWEAVER,
Acting Commissioner.

(Italics supplied.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C. June 8, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I am enclosing for your information copies of letters, dated as above, addressed to Mr. Burt Green and Congressman Harlan Hagen, in regard to the difficulties being encountered in construction of the distribution system for the Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District. These letters have been prepared following the meeting in your office, on May 8 with you, representatives of the district, Under Secretary Tudor, and myself.

We feel that the meeting was instrumental in getting us better acquainted with the problems and the interests of the district. *While the inconvenience and apprehension of the landowners caused by the leaking conditions in the pipelines are regretted, we wish to assure you that the contractor is being required to repair these deficiencies as rapidly as possible.*

We are advising the district that it will not be asked to accept responsibility under its repayment contract with the United States for operation and maintenance of the distribution system, and notice of commencement of the development period will not be given, as provided in the contract, until the system is completed and ready for operation.

We shall be glad to respond to any further requests you may have on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary, Water and Power.

(Italics supplied.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
REGION 2, DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM PROJECTS OFFICE,
Lindsay, Calif., April 18, 1955.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Southern San Joaquin Municipal Utility District,
Delano, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: The letter form of agreement, dated January 3, 1955, and accepted by your district on January 12, 1955, contains statements of responsibility as to cost of operation, maintenance, and repair of distribution systems, as well as relief from cost from those items of maintenance or repairs performed by the contractor in pursuance of its guarantee.

The provisions of the contractor's guarantee for the first unit of work are contained in paragraph 77 (b) of specifications No. 2821 and are essentially as follows:

"Upon completion of the work in accordance with the contract and specifications, the Government will make final acceptance of the work * * * *Provided:* That for a period of 3 years thereafter, the contractor warrants and guarantees the untested pipeline sections against defects in workmanship or in materials furnished by the contractor * * *."

The 3-year guaranty perior for unit 1, lateral 119.6W and lateral 122.5W and sublaterals experies May 2, 1955. After this date, the district will be expected to assume responsibility for repair of pipelines as provided in the January 3, 3, 1955 letter of agreement.

On May 2, 1955, 9 a. m. starting at the Bureau of Reclamation office in Delano, an inspection will be made of the lines in unit 1 and it appears advisable for representatives from your district to participate.

I would appreciate knowing the number to be expected from your District so that the inspection trip can be properly coordinated.

Very truly yours,

W. W. BRENNER,
Projects Construction Engineer.

(Italics supplied.)

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

TRINITY RIVER (TEX.) FLOOD CONTROL

WITNESSES

HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM, REPRESENTING TRINITY RIVER IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
JOHN M. STEMMONS, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, DALLAS COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
HENRY KUCERA, CITY ATTORNEY, DALLAS, TEX.
T. C. FORREST, JR., GENERAL MANAGER, DALLAS COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
DALE MILLER, DALLAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. EVINS. The Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works, Western Section, is pleased to hear this morning Hon. Fritz G. Lanham, an esteemed friend and former colleague, and those whom he wishes to present.

Will you just present your associates, Mr. Lanham, for the record?

Mr. LANHAM. I shall be pleased to do so, Mr. Chairman.

My name, of course, is Fritz Lanham. I represent the Trinity River Improvement Association, as do these other gentlemen in some capacity.

In addition to myself we have present Mr. John Stemmons, of Dallas, Tex., who is chairman of the Dallas County Flood Control District.

Mr. T. Carr Forrest, Jr., who is general manager of that district. Hon. Henry Kucera, city attorney, of Dallas, and also Mr. Dale Miller, who represents the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

I shall make my testimony relatively brief, Mr. Chairman, in order that these gentlemen who have come from a distance may have ample opportunity to present the items in which they are particularly interested, and with which they are especially familiar.

There are in the budget estimates three Trinity River items for projects under construction at the present time. One is a very small appropriation to finish the Fort Worth Floodway project.

The other 2 are the Dallas Floodway project and the Garza-Little Elm Reservoir, which is the last of 4 federally constructed reservoirs with local participation in that area.

I assume that representatives of the Corps of Engineers have already shown appropriately the necessity for these items of appropriation.

I wish to call the committee's attention to the fact that the key to carrying out the master plan for the Trinity River, which was designed by the Corps of Engineers, is the Lake Liberty project, about 60 miles above the mouth of the river. It would afford our last chance to save 6 million acre-feet of water that we are losing annually and which is very much needed in all of that section. And the building of that dam would make the river navigable for 50 additional miles. Of course, it is partially navigable at the present time on the lower part of the river. It would afford also a great protection from the standpoint of ample water supply for that area, and provide against floods that constantly interfere with the work being done in that section, and it would be a great relief for the growing of rice, which is quite a crop in that area.

There are other features of advantage also. I understand that in the survey estimates, it is assumed that about $20,000 would be devoted at this time to surveying this Lake Liberty project. In my judgment, and I think that judgment would be confirmed by the Corps of Engineers, the appropriated figure should be $100,000.

Then we also have the Navarro-Mills project in the planning stage, and funds we understand to be set aside for that probably will carry it along at present. I think Representative Teague will probably either appear or submit a statement concerning that particular project.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to relinquish the remainder of my time for the testimony of these other gentlemen and present to you first, Mr. John M. Stemmons, chairman of the Dallas County Flood Control District.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Lanham. Mr. Stemmons, the committee will be pleased to hear your statement.

Mr. STEMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen of the committee, the Dallas County Flood Control District is an agency of the State government of Texas, its board of directors being appointed by the Governor of the State. Its purpose is to operate and maintain the flood-control facilities at Dallas.

These facilities, gentlemen, were built entirely by local interests, by local money. There was no Federal participation in the construction of these facilities. They were built in the latter twenties at a cost in excess of $20 million, and other than for this Federal project that we presently have, there has been no Federal money spent thereon.

The facilities, gentlemen, protect an investment in the amount of values in excess of $750 million and 50,000 inhabitants.

These 50,000 inhabitants are in the low-income brackets and the roofs of the houses of those 50,000 inhabitants—with the exception of some two-story Federal projects, which are shown in this booklet before you—are all below the height of the levee protecting the area. In other words, were we to have a breach in this levee system which was built in 1929, then the entire area, the entire group of 50,000 people, low-income people, would be completely inundated.

The project has progressed along very well in the last 50 years. It has had participation by the city of Dallas, the county of Dallas, the flood-control district and other agencies in Dallas.

We feel that it is most urgent that this project be expedited in its completion. I am sure that everyone who comes here feels that way. We have the responsibility of protecting 50,000 people from floods—and I might say, by the way, that we have not seen, in the last 5 years, enough rainfall to even get wet, in the State of Texas and in our area. But the history is always that, following these drought areas, we are met immediately by these heavy storms, the intensity of one of which in 1947 was 9 inches of rainfall in 24 hours.

Now the Corps of Engineers tell us that the levee system we have, while it was good enough when built in 1929, is now totally inadequate to withstand the possibility of the type of storms we would have in that area.

As you will note on the page near the last pages of this brochure, which I have submitted to you, a portion of the public housing projects, of 3,500 units, is shown in the foreground, and in the background is shown the levee.

I would like to particularly point out to you that this is the levee being built by the Corps of Engineers, and you can notice the size from this photograph. The old levee which was built down in here [indicating], entirely as I say by local interests, was a good levee at the time it was built, but you can see the difference in size between these two levees which protect this area.

Gentlemen, I simply want to stress the urgency of the early completion of this project. We carried along with our commitments, of obtaining the necessary rights-of-way, which, of course, have been many in a project of this size. The area reclaimed includes 10,500 acres. We do urge you to recommend the appropriation of sums sufficient to bring about the early completion of this project. And I should like, if I might, to ask the representative of the city of Dallas, who has worked with us very closely in this project, to make a statement to you as regards the project of the city of Dallas.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Stemmons.

Mr. Kucera, we will be glad to hear you at this time.

Mr. KUCERA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have been with the city of Dallas government since the inception of the original levee project, so I have seen it grow.

I might say, in passing, that the river, of course, is the primary drainage system, and it is established by nature and we have had to pattern our drainage after that system, with the result that we are now finding ourselves in a position of waiting, and standing by, and

Digitized by the University of Michigan Libraries

watching the project finished or suffering the damage, in case we do not see that it is expedited to its completion.

On the east of the river, we have a population of over 500,000 people; those include not only people in Dallas but 3 other municipalities. On the west of the river, we have a population of over 200,000, and on the drainage, with the levee, we have got certain pressures. From this project, there are several pressure sewers which the city of Dallas has provided through financial participation in defraying the cost of this development.

We have met all of our commitments on that in the matter of rights-of-way, and whatever cash required was paid. We are now standing by with sufficient funds, provided for in our agreement, for finishing the projects.

Speaking a little bit now about the West Dallas situation: For many years in that area, it was outside the city limits, and the city of Dallas was in no position at all under the law to connect it. But as time went on, the laws were changed which gave us the right to do that.

There were some 25,000 to 30,000 people of the low-income brackets, lower than anywhere in the city. The health conditions over there were something awful. We annexed it, not because we hoped to get any financial revenue in the way of taxation, but purely as a matter of local interest in the way of health and sanitation. We have spent $2 million to $3 million putting in water lines and sewer lines in that area to provide for those in that area, which has some 50,000 people, who would be seriously affected in case some part of this levee were to fail.

So we certainly sincerely urge that an early and expeditious completion of the project is necessary for the protection of lives and property.

Now, I want to make a statement with reference to the appropriation that the Corps of Engineers is asking for the Garza-Little Elm.

The city of Dallas made a commitment to pay $3.5 million as its portion of this work. We have paid pretty nearly all of it. There may be a few thousand left, $15,000 to $20,000, and we are waiting for the corps to tell us when that final payment should be made. We have, as I say, paid approximately $3,500,000, as the work progressed, and we are ready to make payment of this final small amount at any time we are advised to do so.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Kucera.

Mr. Stemmons or Mr. Lanham, do you have any further statement?

Mr. LANHAM. May I just mention one additional fact?

Mr. EVINS. You certainly may, Mr. Lanham.

Mr. LANHAM. My home city is Fort Worth, which is just 30 miles west of Dallas, and is on the Trinity River, as is Dallas.

In 1949, we had a terrible flood in Fort Worth, $15 million worth of property was destroyed; over 3,000 people were rendered homeless for quite a while; several people were killed. One of my stepsons lived in that area, and the water was over the top of his house, and he lost everything he had, barely escaping with his life.

The situation in Dallas, if we should have a repetition of such a flood, would be even more serious and much more destructive. Local Trinity interests have contributed, I think, to a greater extent than any other comparable area in the United States, toward these various projects. And it is highly important that the flood control work in Dallas go on with this appropriation. Garza-Little Elm is the last of

these four reservoirs which have been built by the Federal Government, with local assistance in great measure. These projects should be speedily completed.

The Federal Government and the local people have done a great work in the upper part of the Trinity River. In addition to the three items in the budget estimates, an important thing now is to look after properly the planning and surveys of the middle and lower sections of the river, in order that this master plan, devised by the Corps of Engineers for the Trinity River, may be carried on to a satisfactory completion.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Lanham, you enjoyed a great reputation while in Congress of being a very able Congressman, and I see now, being out of Congress, you are continuing that reputation in the things you advocate.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that very much, Mr. Chairman, and it is always a great pleasure to me to renew this genial association.

Mr. EVINS. The funds that you are requesting are funds which the Bureau of the Budget has at this time approved?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are not asking for any increase in these three items of appropriation on these projects. One of them is a very small appropriation, which will complete the Fort Worth Floodway. But the Garza-Little Elm and the Dallas Floodway are most important projects for the protection in many ways of that great metropolitan section.

Mr. EVINS. One further question, Mr. Lanham: You spoke earlier of local participation.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Do you have, or does any of your associates have, the round figures showing approximately the amount of money that Dallas local people have put into these levees?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not have that information in detail; perhaps Mr. Stemmons may have, but in the aggregate it will be a very substantial sum. And let me say further that the original levees all along the Trinity River, in addition to several large reservoirs, were constructed entirely by local people.

Mr. EVINS. And now then that we have some Lanham Housing Act projects in that area, we have got to spend some Federal funds to protect the housing in that area.

Mr. LANHAM. And also to protect the lives of the people who live in those houses.

Mr. STEMMONS. Mr. Chairman, there were $20 million spent originally by local interests on those projects.

Mr. EVINS. And since the original outlay, how much additional contribution?

Mr. STEMMONS. Since that time there has been approximately—do you mean just in the Dallas project?

Mr. EVINS. The total amount of local contributions on these levees to date, the approximate amount?

Mr. STEMMONS. I will say, Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of Fort Worth, that they asked for a bond issue a few years ago from the standpoint of this flood protection, and my recollection is that it was in the sum of $7 million which I think was approved by the local people and the money made available.

Mr. EVINS. $20 million from Dallas and $7 million from Fort Worth or a total of $27 million. Now do you have information showing how much more?

Mr. LANHAM. They have built all of these levees and they have done a great deal more. Their contributions in the aggregate have been very considerable.

Mr. STEMMONS. Of course, the levees were built out of the $20 million, which was originally spent.

Now, in the general operation and maintenance on that Mr. Chairman, there has perhaps been another three or four millions dollars spent since 1929 in maintaining and operating these facilities.

I would like to call this one particular item to your attention—it is set out in this brochure, and this will stand checking at any time—and that is that the value of the property protected by this system, under the plan set out by the Corps of Engineers, is in the amount of $750 million. And those values were arrived at from the tax records of the city of Dallas. They were arrived at that way and we can substantiate those values.

There is in addition, 50,000 people, 50,000 low-income people, the roofs of whose homes are all below the tops of the levees that are shown in this brochure that has been submitted to you.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Stemmons, there has been approximately $30 million——

Mr. STEMMONS. In round numbers.

Mr. EVINS. In round numbers—that is what I am trying to arrive at, approximately $30 million have been spent by local people on these levees.

Mr. STEMMONS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. How much Federal funds has been spent?

Mr. STEMMONS. Up to the present time, approximately $3,100,000 has been spent, or is obligated for at the present time, that is for Dallas.

Mr. KUCERA. Mr. Chairmain, I would like to supplement the statement here, so far as the city of Dallas is concerned.

A part of this project is in the city limits of the city of Dallas, a good part of it is not.

In order to cooperate from the standpoint of the city, and not to impose double taxation on those people for the same purpose, a bill was drawn and passed through the legislature which allows credit on the city tax rolls for the flood control and the levee tax, and in that way the city of Dallas has aided the property owners in this project over here by relinquishing a part of the general taxing system for that purpose.

Mr. EVINS. That you, Mr. Kucera.

Mr. Forrest, do you have a statement?

Mr. FORREST. No, Mr. Chairman. These gentlemen have covered it.

Mr. JENSEN. This appears to be a very necessary and worthy project, and from the budget standpoint, there is no constroversy whatsoever.

I do want to say that I am happy to see my old colleague and friend, Fritz Lanham here. Fritz Lanham and I have been very close friends for many, many years, and it is always a pleasure to see Mr. Lanham. He is held in such esteem by all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, because of his fairness and because of his fine patriotism.

We need men like you in America.

Mr. LANHAM. Thank you very much, and I reciprocate in full that gracious statement, Mr. Jensen.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. We will insert into the record a statement by Congressman Olin E. Teague. Thank you gentlemen, for your presentation.

(The statement is as follows:)

NAVARRO MILLS RESERVOIR

Mr. Chairman, I appear here today before your subcommittee in support of the request of the Corps of Engineers for $50,000 to be used for advance engineering and design studies in conjunction with the reservoir and dam authorized under the 1954 Flood Control Act to be constructed on the Richland Creek at the Navarro Mills site.

The Navarro Mills Reservoir will be the key project of the watershed flood control system for the Trinity. The Army engineers have already put into operation the Garza-Little Elm project and this about completes the upper portion of the Trinity watershed area. The Navarro Mills Reservoir is needed for the direct flood protection of some 40 to 45,000 acres of fertile plains of the Richland Creek and tributaries and of the many thousands of additional acres at the junction of this creek and the Trinity River slightly downstream. It will in addition assist in holding back the peak of the Trinity floods and will provide unmeasurable benefits to the citizens of Corsicana, Tex., the major nearby population center in water supply features.

It is my understanding that already the interested governmental agencies have held several meetings for the purpose of coordinating their overall plans for the development of this watershed area under the provisions of the recently enacted Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 and the funds requested by the Corps of Engineers herein will further their efforts in this project. Your careful consideration and approval of this request will be greatly appreciated.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

INTRACOASTAL CANAL—LOUISIANA—TEXAS

WITNESS

DALE MILLER, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, INTRACOASTAL CANAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I was scheduled to appear this afternoon, but if the committee has a few minutes to hear me now, I think I can conclude without interrupting your schedule.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be glad to hear Mr. Dale Miller at this time.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, my name is Dale Miller, and I am executive vice president of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, with principal offices in Houston. I appear before you today to urge your favorable consideration of important navigation projects identified with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway system.

The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, as you gentlemen know, is a remarkable transportation facility extending more than a thousand miles from the west coast of Florida to the Mexico border, and connecting at New Orleans with the vast inland waterway system of the

Mississippi and Ohio Valleys. This intracoastal canal, authorized by Congress on the expectation that it would ultimately develop about 5 million tons of commerce a year, is now carrying in excess of 42 million tons a year. Despite its comparatively shallow dimensions, more tonnage moves over the intracoastal canal than through the Panama Canal. And what it has contributed to the economic development of the gulf coast is almost incalculable. It has been a potent factor in the transformation of the lethargic bayou country of Louisiana and the virtual wilderness of the Texas coast into a rapidly developing industrial empire, providing safe and economical transportation for millions of tons of petroleum products, chemicals, and other commodities which are important to the national economy and essential to the national defense.

The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway consists not only of a main channel but of a number of related navigation projects, many of which are completed, but some of which are still awaiting the appropriation of construction funds. I would like to refer to a few of these projects, but I shall not discuss them in detail, because in most cases they will be represented by other witnesses, or by the submission of appropriate briefs which I am sure will merit the subcommittee's attention.

The Bureau of the Budget has recommended construction funds for the next fiscal year for two vitally important Gulf Intracoastal Waterway projects in Louisiana, $1,263,000 for the Algiers cutoff and lock, and $1,260,000 for the Morgan City-Port Allen alternate route. The sum recommended for the Algiers work is all that is needed to complete the $15 million alternate access route to the Mississippi at New Orleans, which has been sorely needed to relieve the heavy congestion at Harvey lock. Since the amount sought for the next fiscal year will complete the job, I think it is unnecessary for me to take up the time of the subcommittee to justify that expenditure.

As to the $1,260,000 recommended for the Morgan City-Port Allen route of the canal, it is our conviction that no project under consideration in the bill is more urgently in need of prompt construction. This alternate route would reduce from 225 miles to only 65 miles the distance which all barge tows must travel to and from the producing areas of Texas and the processing centers on the extensive Mississippi and Ohio River systems—for this short route would eliminate the necessity of barge traffic moving by way of the circuitous route down to New Orleans. Well-informed witnesses will testify on this project during the course of your hearings, and only because of that fact I shall resist the temptation to delineate its merits in detail. Suffice it to say that in the considered judgment of our association there is probably no major project in the United States which will produce greater benefits immediately upon completion. It is now a continuing project, Congress having appropriated funds last year to initiate construction.

An important project in Texas which merits an immediate appropriation of construction funds is the authorized realinement of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway at Aransas Pass, Tex. Construction of this short route would produce substantial savings in transportation costs; would reduce navigation hazards in the congested Corpus Christi ship channel with which the present circuitous route coincides; would provide a haven of refuge during storm periods;

and would have the further advantage of opening up for industrial development a shoreline in the very center of a rich chemical and petroleum area. Although the benefits anticipated from construction of this new route were considered substantial at the time of its authorization, it is a significant fact that tonnage now moving on that section of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway is two and one-half times greater than that which existed at the time it was authorized. This project fully warrants the appropriation of construction funds.

The canalization of the Guadalupe River in Texas is another authorized project which deserves high priority in the civil-works program. This inland extension of the intracoastal canal would penetrate one of the most productive areas in Texas, and, since the project was authorized, some of the largest industries to be located on the gulf coast in recent years have been established along the proposed route. This important project is strongly supported by both a high ratio of benefits to cost and a substantial degree of local participation. Construction of this needed work has been too long deferred, and I urge the subcommittee to give it careful consideration. It is my understanding that local intereste will file a comprehensive brief, which I hope will have your earnest attention.

The Colorado River in Texas is another important tributary to the intracoastal canal system, and a canalization project on that river has likewise been authorized but not yet constructed. This channel, extending 17 miles upstream from its intersection with the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to the vicinity of Bay City, would serve an area rich in natural resources; and we have no doubt that it would promptly develop more than sufficient tonnage to justify the relatively low cost of its construction. Here again local interests will provide this subcommittee with a detailed brief, and I trust that it too will merit your consideration.

It is my understanding that you have under consideration in this bill a provision which would empower the Chief of Engineers to construct certain small meritorious projects which are not otherwise specifically provided for in the civil-functions bill. In our opinion this is one of the most constructive proposals which have yet been advanced to implement and make more effective a national public-works program. There are a number of worthy small projects in our area, as I am sure there are in other sections of the country, which have unwittingly been neglected because their modest size and low cost fail to command the same degree of attention which of necessity is accorded comprehensive and costly projects.

For example, there is a small project on the south Texas coast called Little Bay, a shallow-draft offshot of the intracoastal canal which was authorized 5 years ago. The total Federal cost of this project is only $33,000, yet local interests, in expectation of this small appropriation, have constructed breakwaters and retaining walls in the amount of $90,000. In other words, the local participation is nearly three times the Federal Government's share, yet the work accomplished by local interests will stand there virtually useless until the Federal Government makes its own small contribution available. There are other such small projects in our area—harbors of refuge at Seadrift and Port Aransas, and a tributary channel and small harbor at Aransas Pass—which come within the same general category.

61653—55—pt. 2——29

Although Government agencies and Congress would not consciously ignore such needed improvements, it is nonetheless true that small projects are sometimes lost in the shuffle when attention must naturally be concentrated on larger and more complex programs. If the Corps of Engineers were allotted a certain lump sum for the construction, at its discretion, of a selected group of small projects, long-needed improvements could be effectuated at low cost, local interests would be relieved of the burden of constantly petitioning Congress for modest appropriations, and congressional committees would likewise be relieved of the task of devoting a disproportionate amount of time from its busy schedule to the study of small projects. We strongly recommend that such a provision be included in the civil-functions bill.

Witnesses appearing before you on various projects throughout the United States are naturally so much interested in the prompt construction of authorized work that too little emphasis is often placed on the need for sufficient survey funds to perpetuate a sound public works program. The rapid expansion of the national economy and unprecedented growth in population underscore the importance, in our judgment, of a concomitant development of a realistic public works program for the future, and such a program for tomorrow can be assured only through the appropriation of adequate survey funds today. On the Trinity River in Texas, for instance, an urgent need exists for the early construction of proposed Lake Liberty, a project which will prove of great benefit to the entire Trinity River Valley, yet the need for its authorization cannot be established until adequate survey funds are provided. I have no doubt that similar situations prevail elsewhere throughout the Nation, and I respectfully suggest that provision be made for adequate survey funds to carry on the expanded public works program which is so essential to the future welfare of the country.

And now, gentlemen, a word in conclusion: This year the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas is commemorating its 50th anniversary. Founded in Victoria, Tex., on August 8, 1905, our association is today, we believe, the oldest inland waterway organization in the United States, and throughout the half century our association, the Corps of Engineers, and the Congress of the United States have worked together, in close and effective cooperation, to create what the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway is today. On the occasion of our 50th anniversary, we extend to you—and, through you, to your distinguished predecessors in the Congress—our grateful appreciation for the years of conscientious consideration which you have devoted to the meritorious projects in our gulf coast country.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much, Mr. Miller, for your fine statement.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TEX.

WITNESS

HON. JACK BROOKS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Brooks, I believe you desire to submit a statement to the committee with reference to the Sabine-Neches Waterway.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to submit the following statement.

(The statement referred to follows:)

SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY

Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to express my appreciation for being able to present this testimony before this group of the House Appropriations Committee.

In a report dated October 8, 1951, reviewing the situation concerning the condition of the Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, Galveston, Tex., recommended that the existing project be modified to provide for:

(*a*) Rectification of certain reaches of the existing Sabine Pass Channel, Sabine-Neches Canal, and the Neches River and Sabine River Channels;

(*b*) Widening the entrance channel to the Port Arthur turning basin;

(*c*) Easing the curve at the junction of the Port Arthur and the Sabine-Neches Canals;

(*d*) Relocation and enlargement of the Sabine pass anchorage basin to 1,500 feet wide by 3,000 feet long;

(*e*) Widening the Sabine-Neches Canal from the mouth of the Neches River to the mouth of the Sabine River and the Sabine River Channel to the upper end of the project to a width of 200 feet, except the channel around Harbor Island at Orange;

(*f*) Deepening the Sabine River Channel from the cutoff near Orange to the upper end of the project to a depth of 30 feet except around Harbor Island at Orange; and

(*g*) Enlarging the area at the entrance to the Orange municipal slip to provide a maneuvering basin.

This recommendation was embodied in Senate Document 80, 83d Congress, 2d session, and was accompanied by appropriate drawings of the proposals.

The proposal was approved at an estimated cost to the United States of $6,875,000 for new work and an increase of $121,000 in the approved cost of annual maintenance. The United States is to receive all necessary easements free of cost, be free from any damages that might result from construction or maintenance of the project and is restricted from dredging within 50 feet of any existing pierheads, wharves or structures.

The proposal was subsequently approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Corps of Engineers on December 18, 1952; the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, January 23, 1953; Chief of Resources and Civil Works Division, Bureau of the Budget, August 10, 1953; and was forwarded to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works by the Acting Secretary of the Army, August 24, 1953.

The Sabine-Neches proposal was incorporated into H. R. 9859, an omnibus bill, which became Public Law 780 of the 83d Congress, thus authorizing work on the project pending necessary appropriations.

Gentlemen, I submit that this project is of great importance not only to the economic well-being of the gulf coast area, but to the country as an integral whole. Five of the world's largest oil refineries and many important chemical industries are located in this immediate area. Almost one-eighth of all the oil produced in the United States is shipped from these refineries in deep-draft vessels to both domestic and foreign ports. The Sabine-Neches Waterway is trav-

ersed by more vessels of 30-foot draft and over than any other waterway in the Nation with the one exception of New York Harbor.

At present it is estimated by the Corps of Engineers that the Sabine-Neches Waterway can accommodate vessels up to 27,000 dead weight tons, and that traffic over than tonnage would require enlargement of the channels to insure operation under reasonable conditions of safety and convenience.

The trend in present building of oceangoing tankers is for larger and faster ships. It is estimated that by 1960, the old T–2 and T–3 type tankers, which are able to carry a full load of oil through the present channels, will only represent 30 percent of the total ships in service. Already our refining companies are compelled to ship out partially loaded vessels in order to clear the channels, and the situation becomes more acute every month.

We find ourselves in the same situation as a jet bomber pilot might find himself if the runway was only long enough for him to take off with a partial load of bombs. We need the bomber with a full load and the wise thing seems to be to lengthen the runway * * * or enlarge the waterway, in this instance.

Again let me say that I appreciate this opportunity to present this testimony. I would be most happy to try to answer any questions that you migh have concerning this Sabine-Neches Waterway proposals.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

MCGEE BEND DAM-NECHES-ANGELINA RIVER

WITNESSES

HON. JACK BROOKS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS
ED EASTERLING, LOWER NECHES VALLEY AUTHORITY
D. N. BEASLEY, MANAGER, DEEP EAST TEXAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES, SAN AUGUSTINE
M. T. POTTS, MANAGER, SAM HOUSTON ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, LIVINGSTON
E. LAURENCE BURNETT, CONSULTING ENGINEER, FORT WORTH
TROY MITCHELL, JASPER-NEWTON ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, KIRBYVILLE
HOWARD HICKS, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, BEAUMONT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
LYLE VICKERS, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, PORT ARTHUR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear at this time our esteemed colleague and friend, Congressman Jack Brooks, and the testimony of the others whom he wishes to present.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We had originally asked for 30 minutes and we shall try not to run over the time limit, so that you can get back on your 11 o'clock schedule.

I appreciate this opportunity to testify and of coming here in the interest of what is known as the McGee-Bend Dam which is a multipurpose dam on the Neches-Angelna Rver.

This project was originally authorized some years ago and the essential crux of this problem is that there were two dams to be built, one this major project, and one a re-regulating dam, with which of course, you are familiar.

The re-regulating dam was built with local contributions of $2 million, which the LVNA—the lower Neches Valley Authority—contributed toward the construction of this regulating dam known as dam

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

B. Dam B was built, but then they did not complete the project, and my feeling is, and the feeling of a half million people in that immediate watershed is, that the Government has failed to maintain its obligation and its part of the contract that they made in good faith with the people down there.

And since there has been no starts ordered, you recall, since Dam B was built, then directive A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget changed the criteria which, as you know, is a very important factor in the Corps of Engineers' recommendations.

So we in our district feel that the rules have been changed with the game just half over, and they are now refusing to finish out the Government's obligation which will allow us to complete our obligation.

We in this district had already obligated ourselves to contribute $3 million in additional cash toward the completion of these major multi-purpose dams. There was some question raised initially about power. I think we have clearly established that the cost of the power will be fully repaid by sale of power to the private utility companies, which have never opposed this project. I think you understand that in my district the REA buys their power primarily from the Gulf States Utility, and there is a very cooperative attitude; they get along splendidly. The utility company is not opposing this project, and will be very happy to see the project completed, because most of the hydroelectric power will be an excellent grade of power for peaking purposes and will be of real benefit to them. They are very happy to have it built.

I believe that that is the essential background, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do want to say that I have some knowledge of this project and I have heard that everything is very harmonious, and that the REA's are going to be completely taken care of by this setup as it is now proposed, and from everything I have heard, Mr. Chairman, everything is in good order.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for permitting this interruption.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Brooks.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In accordance with the administration's new policy of increasing the requirements of local contribution, the people in my district have gotten together, and made every possible effort they could to go over and above their contractual obligations with the United States Government by making this effort to furnish additional money to the Government. They have, to the extent of their financial possibilities, made arrangements with investors and brokers concerning the possibility of bonds and so forth, and they have said they are in position, and they would be willing and would be pleased to have an authorization that would give them some construction money to provide that the LNVA furnish to the Government $10 million over a period of some 50 years, based on $200,000 per year payment by the LNVA to the United States Government as an additional contribution by the people.

Now, at this time, I should like to introduce Mr. Ed Easterling, for the LNVA.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Easterling, the committee will be very glad to hear you.

Mr. EASTERLING. Gentlemen of the committee, as Congressman Brooks has stated here, this is really an extraordinary situation, and we feel that it is so extraordinary that it calls for some very intense action on the part of the Congress.

This request is not in the budget, as you know; that is, it is not scheduled in the budget and we are asking this committee to consider the matter, and we are going to present it to you here with the idea of amending the bill and putting an item in the bill providing for the construction of this project.

I think, in order for you to understand the seriousness of our problem that you should realize the importance of this project to all of the southwest territory.

This Neches-Angelina River is the biggest river in Texas and has an annual runoff of 5 million acre-feet of water, which is a tremendous runoff. But this all occurs in the winter and spring months, causing damages from floods. And in summer we have droughts which curtail our water supply.

We are now on the gulf coast. The Neches River rises up about parallel with the city of Dallas in northeast Texas and flows down into the Gulf of Mexico.

In the lower reaches of the river we have the greatest oil refinery center in the world, you might say; we have 5 big refineries which process 700,000 barrels of oil daily. We have petro chemical plants. We are in the middle of the rice belt. We have thousands of acres of rice land down there that someday will be in production.

We are presently, and have been on account of the water shortage, irrigating 55,000 acres of rice land. We have some 300,000 acres available for future production.

Our whole development there is at a standstill on account of the fact that during the summer months, during the irrigation period, we just run out of water. That has been going on since our main development started, between 1925 and 1940, our early development.

On account of these conditions, Congress was requested, or the Public Works Committee at that time, was requested to make an investigation of this matter and they caused a study to be made and report on the development of this river.

This report was filed with Congress in 1945. Congress authorized the development of these rivers by the building of 2 major dams, 1 on the upper Neches and 1 on the Angelina River, with 2 small reregulating dams below. At that time the estimated cost of this whole project, under the 1939 study, was $29 million. Congress authorized it in 1945 without any up-to-date study on the project.

Immediately after that authorization in 1945 the Corps of Engineers started to work on a comprehensive, definite project report. They came up in 1946 with a report. They had a public hearing down in the area. At that time they said that these rivers could be controlled by building one big dam on the Angelina River and a small reregulating dam below that dam, between the confluence of the Neches and the Angelina Rivers.

These two dams are an integral part of each other. They are one unit. That is what they called it. The 2 dams were to be 1 unit and if these 2 dams were built all the purposes of the 1945 authorization could be accomplished.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

That report stated that the cost of the McGee Bend Dam, the big one, would be $43 million and the small dam $7 million.

Now, we have water shortages down there that threaten the shutting down of these tremendous interests. I will show you some pictures of the nature of them.

Agriculture in our area has first precedence with regard to the water supply.

Mr. HAND. Is that provided by law?

Mr. EASTERLING. Yes. The Texas law provides for that. They had the first appropriations for water.

So, in order not to have a catastrophe happen—and when I say "catastrophe," it was realized even in 1945—the War Production Board ordered the Corps of Engineers to start construction of this small dam "B", the reregulating dam, because of the fact if war were to continue they would need this supply of water. I think that is what gave us the idea that we should build the small dam first.

We had a long discussion with the Corps of Engineers and it was agreed they would go in there and build the reregulating dam; that if they would build it first they would then have a temporary supply of water pending the construction of the Bib McGee Bend Dam. Mind you, this is a reregulating dam to take care of the discharge of the McGee Bend Dam in the production of power.

So, after we made those agreements that we would start this small dam, in 1947 the Corps of Engineers appeared before the Appropriations Committee of Congress and asked for $31,300,000 to begin construction of dam "B." The project report was fully explained. The original authorization provided that before any element of project "B" started that some local agency, or the State of Texas would assure that they would contribute $5 million toward the cost of the project.

The Corps of Engineers, knowing that the lower Neches authority was interested in this project and development, came to us and said, "Why do you not join with the Federal Government and get this project underway by making an assurance of paying in this $5 million on completion of this project?"

We realized that although there was no allocation of water in the project to anyone, that just from building this dam and having the flow of that river increased from the discharge of the flood control and hydro development, we would have an increased flow in the river and it would be worth $5 million to us.

So, in 1947, prior to this appropriation, we made the assurance we would pay the $5 million.

In 1948, as you gentlemen will remember who were in Congress at that time, there was a scarcity of funds for public works. The Corps of Engineers came to us and said that the Congress was not going to give them enough money to finish the dam, but if we would amend our assurance and give $2 million for the construction of dam "B," instead of waiting to give $5 million for both dams, they could get the dam built right away and get it finished and stop the gap temporarily of our shortage of water. It did prevent a catastrophe in our area.

We amended our assurance and paid into the project $2 million in cash. We borrowed the money. We had to issue revenue bonds against our revenues. We sell and distribute raw water in that area. We amended our assurance and put $2 million into that and agreed to pay the remaining $3 million on the completion of the McGee Dam.

Before we paid that $2 million in 1949, in 1950 we made 2 payments, 1 of $1,500,000 and 1 of $500,000. Before the dam was completed the Corps of Engineers came before the Appropriations Committee and said, "Now, we are building and finishing up this dam "B" and we are going to start now to build the big dam."

They asked for $200,000 for each of those years. They already had about $250,000 in planning money. They asked for $200,000 for planning in 1949. In 1950 they asked for $200,000. In 1951, $75,000. In 1952 they got an additional $25,000.

All the time at each one of those hearings they would fully explain this project to the Appropriations Committee. They knew that it was costing $43 million. They stated the cost to benefits ratio was 1 to 1.44. They knew our own contributions to the project was $3 million.

There is an evaluation placed on this conservation water. According to the Corps of Engineers the evaluation placed on this water is sufficient to allay its cost. The hydroelectric power has never been questioned. They have been before the Congress and before the Bureau of the Budget who budget these items.

So there we have in 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952 the Congress making appropriations for this project. We had a thorough understanding that this whole project was one project, that the two dams were one project, and dam "B" was an integral part of the McGee Bend Dam, just like the turbines or the penstocks in McGee Bend.

Then we come to some change in policy. Whether it was good or bad, that is something that happened after the project got under way. We have very limited resources, our authority. We owe that $2 million now. We are paying interest on it and amortizing it out over a 35-year period. We owe about $2,500,000 for capital improvements. We are carrying that much indebtedness and we have a big operation and maintenance expense. In fact, our whole resources are impounded on this project. We are irrevocably bound with the Federal Government in the McGee Bend project, and as Mr. Brooks said, we have 500,000 people and a 10,000-square-mile watershed. We have a tremendous potential industrial area and a potential agricultural area if and when agricultural products will be needed in greater supply than they are at the present time.

We cannot see how any agency of the Government except the Congress itself can say, with these conditions, this project shall not go ahead. I think if it had not been for a directive of the Bureau of the Budget, or a policy of the Bureau of the Budget, we would not have been halted, we would not have been stymied for the last 3 years.

The whole population of that section of Texas has had its eyes on this project. They need it. It is one of the most badly needed projects in that section of the United States. We just cannot understand why. For all these years this was a going project and then suddenly in 1952 and 1953 we come to a halt. We realize that we have to put up some more money on this project.

They question hydroelectric power benefits and they question the water supply benefits. Mind you, we know that there are tremendous valuable water benefits, conservation water benefits, in this project that will be realized by the Government other than what we are going

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to pay into it. We have paid $2 million into it. We are willing to pay $3 million into this project under our present assurance.

Mind you, when this project was authorized, as I stated, it was for $29 million, and before it was to be started we had to agree to pay $5 million. That is 18 percent. So, on the basis of the original authorization, although we feel like these assurances and agreements and commitments place a direct obligation and responsibility on the Federal Government to continue this project under our original agreement, we are willing to just go beyond that and say that the original basis was 18 percent of the cost so we will come to that 18 percent just as far as our ability to pay is concerned.

So, if we have already given $2 million, we will give $3 million on completion of McGee Bend Dam and for each year after for 50 years we will give $200,000. That will be $15 million that the Federal Government is going to get from the local agency just to see this additional supply of water flowing this river.

When you get over to the hydroelectric power there is not a great differential. It is just an eighth of a percent differential in the cost-to-benefits ratio. The actual cost of putting the 45,000 kilowatts in this dam annually is $762,000 a year. That is the actual incremental cost, as they call it. With power, that is what it will cost to amortize the dam.

The Federal Power Commission puts a $908,000 value on the power. They say that the economic cost, not the actual cost, is $989,200.

We have employed a hydroelectric engineer to make a separate investigation of this project on the basis of the local utility, just taking the local utility with what they have on file with the Federal Power Commission, to find out what is the present value of that power to them now and what will be the value of that power in future years. Gas prices, which are the medium of creating electricty in that area, are continuously going up. I will say in 10 years gas prices are going to be 50 percent higher in that area, although within a radius of 100 miles of Beaumont, Tex., where this project is centered, there are at least 50 to 75 producing oil and gas fields.

The price is going up and the value of the power is going up correspondingly.

I would like for Mr. Burnett to give you a brief summary of an analysis of power benefits of this project.

Mr. EVINS. Do you have some other witnesses that you want to present?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. I would like to present Mr. Burnett at a later date. I think that Mr. Beasley could concisely give the REA viewpoint. He represents the Deep Texas Cooperative. I think that we should submit Mr. Burnett's statement. We have a copy here for each of the members. We have his statement, but rather than have him read that, I will ask Mr. Beasley to say a few words.

Mr. EVINS. We will insert Mr. Burnett's statement in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

ECONOMIC APPRAISAL OF THE POTENTIAL HYDROELECTRIC POWER OUTPUT OF THE McGEE BEND PROJECT IN THE LOWER NECHES RIVER BASIN, TEXAS

The McGee Bend project, on the Angelina River in Texas, is the major flow-regulating unit in the system of multiple-purpose reservoirs authorized by the

Congress for Federal construction. Together with the presently completed dam B project, it would serve the primary functions of flood control, water conservation, and the development of hydroelectric power. However, the size of dam B reservoir is too small to significantly provide any of these benefits without the McGee Bend project. The many interests in the lower Neches River Valley are now seeking early initiation of actual construction of the McGee Bend project in order that there soon may be adequately realized the envisaged benefits for which both the Lower Neches Valley Authority and the Federal Government have already committed considerable funds.

The recent restudy of the project by the Corps of Engineers indicates that McGee Bend is economically feasible, according to long-standing criteria for economic appraisal. When only the major functions of flood control, water conservation, and power are considered, the economic ratio of benefits to costs for the project as a whole is 1.30 to 1.00. And when the incidental benefits due to pollution abatement, fish and wildlife preservation, and recreation are included, the economic ratio becomes 1.66 to 1.00. Furthermore, when the costs and charges of the project are allocated to each of the major functions, by the separable cost-remaining benefits method, the economic ratios thus associated with functions are: for flood control, 1.01; conservation, 1.70; and power, 1.01.

The Federal Power Commission has recently restudied the value of McGee Bend power output. For the 43,000 kilowatts of dependable capacity it has estimated a value of $17.30 per kilowatt-year and for the 129,300,000 kilowatt-hours of average annual energy it has estimated a value of 1.27 mills per kilowatt-hour, thus setting the average annual monetary benefit of McGee Bend power equal to $908,100 per year, at the high tension side of McGee Bend switchyard. From the Corps of Engineers allocation of cost to the power function, the total annual charges against power, including interest on the investment, amortization, and operating and maintenance costs, amount to $901,900 per year. The economic ratio of the power function thus becomes 1.01.

Heretofore, the inclusion of power in the project would be considered justified if the increased costs of the project due to the power facilities were less than the power benefits. But with the advent of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-47, which is presently being revised, and by virtue of certain other Federal interagency agreements, the economic cost of power in the project would include not only the project costs chargeable to power but also the annual taxes foregone by Federal development rather than by private development of the power. According to this criterion, the economic cost of power in the McGee Bend project were stated to be $989,200 annually. This value was obtained by adding to the minimum permissible allocation of $762,200 the estimate of foregone taxes, which were apparently taken as 25 percent of the annual power benefits, and thus producing the amount of $989,200 as the economic cost of the power function.

The power benefits thus apparently fail the economic costs of the power function by $81,000 per year, or by about 8.9 percent, due entirely to including as a project cost the Federal taxes foregone. However, the Federal taxes that would be foregone by long delaying construction of the McGee Bend project for full development of the industrial and agricultural opportunities of the area, and their associated economic activities, would probably be of such magnitude as to far outweigh the cited loss of only $81,000 per year. Furthermore, this small difference seems hardly large enough to stigmatize completion of a project that not only is so urgently needed but also is economically attractive as a whole, even when the power taxes foregone are included as a project cost. Consequently it appeared desirable to reexamine the considerations by which the annual power value of $908,100 was derived and to determine its applicability to the particular costs and values within the specific power systems into which the McGee Bend power could be absorbed.

In its evaluation of the McGee Bend power output the Federal Power Commission based its findings on costs and ratios that were representative of average or typical values throughout a region—various components of the estimate deriving from various regions, ranging from statewide to nationwide in scope. It is believed, rather, that the value of the power to a particular private utility company should be measured by the power costs incurred within that particular utility's system. Various components of cost, as well as the aggregate power costs, vary between systems—and the McGee Bend hydropower may thus have substantial value to one system and no value at all to another, even though both systems are contiguous to the hydroproject.

An independent report has been prepared in which has been analyzed the value of McGee Bend hydro output with particular reference to its utilization in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the power system of the Gulf States Utilities Co. For this analysis the basic data on the costs and operations of the plants and systems of the Gulf States Utilities Co. have been gathered from available publications of the Federal Power Commission for the years 1947 through 1953. Based on average cost figures derived for this period, it was estimated that the cost of producing and delivering to the GSU system load centers an amount of power equivalent to the average annual output of McGee Bend would be in the neighborhood of $1,176,400 per year, or, evaluated at the high-tension side of the McGee Bend switchyard, about $1,076,300 per year. If based on the average costs for only the year 1953, the corresponding costs would be $1,417,500 and $1,319,600, respectively.

However, if the value of McGee Bend power were to be based on costs of production and transmission due to a brand-new, future, steam-electric plant with a heat rate of 10,000 B. t. u. per kilowatt-hour and a fuel cost of 15 cents per million B. t. u., as may be expected sometime around 1960, its annual value would be about $1,119,000 at the high-tension bus. For the present average fuel price of 10 cents per million B. t. u., the corresponding value would be $1,054,000. And for the 20-cent rate, its value would be nearly $1,183,000 per year.

It thus appears that the maximum value of McGee Bend hydropower at the high-tension bus could be in excess of $1,300,000 per year, and that its minimum value would increase from about $1,054,000 annually, for conditions to be expected in the immediate future, to a value of around $1,200,000, as may be expected sometime after 1965. These estimates of annual value of McGee Bend power to the Gulf States Utilities Co. in particular thus exceed the estimates of economic cost of $989,200 for providing the power from the Federal project. And thus, in accordance with Federal policy and procedures for economic justification of projects, the power features of the McGee Bend project may be adjudged economically feasible.

Mr. BEASLEY. I would like to point out that the statements which have been made up to now, and those that Mr. Burnett has filed with you, in our opinion certainly will justify and establish beyond any question of doubt, the need for the project, its feasibility, the local contributions, and so forth, which are rather substantial.

Mr. Easterling has detailed them.

I would like to emphasize again this is a going project, one under way, a single unit composed of a small reregulating dam already constructed, and the big dam that we are asking you gentlemen to give consideration to helping us get activated again.

There is a lot of equity in this project over and above what might be in a project that had never been started. Our people feel there is a definite commitment on the part of LNVA on the one hand, and the people they represent in the Federal Government on the other hand, because they have been up here through the years and have reached an agreement with the engineers and with the Congress and certain commitments have been made.

We feel that there is an unusual degree of equity, and that is what we are contending for.

Now, the power which has been questioned in the past year or two is immediately salable. There is no question about its sale. Last year we came before this Subcommittee on Public Works and placed in the record a letter from the local utility wherein they offered in writing $800,000 for this power, which is about $38,000 more than the cost of the depreciation, interest, maintenance, and operation. That is the Army engineers' figure on the annual total cost. That is a matter of record.

The other major power company to the north of this area, the Texas Power & Light Co., indicated recently a great interest in getting at least a portion of the power from this dam. Right now, we are in the

advanced stages of negotiating with that company for our local cooperative to get a tie line, a transmission line, built to the dam site in advance of construction of McGee, and the company itself will wind up with some $400,000 in a transmission line to the dam site with the hope that they will get the output of at least one of these 15,000 kilowatt units.

I think this demonstrates unquestionably that Gulf States has made an offer in writing and that the Texas Power & Light Co. is willing to invest money in lines on the prospect this power will be available some time.

Our Congressman has already told you of the fine working relationship of the electric cooperatives in the area. Three of them are represented here today. We serve some 24,000 rural consumers in the general area of this project.

The dam itself is in Jasper County, which is somewhat a no man's land because up until this time there has been no private power company with transmission facilities still in this county. In fact, most of our local cooperatives were built in an area in which there was no power supply. That is why we have had to construct transmission lines ourselves, and we are buying power from three separate private utility companies around the perimeter of our area. This dam is in between these companies. Both of them have indicated an interest in coming down and getting some of the peaking capacity. We are working closely with them and they with us. No one is opposing it in the power field. The power, obviously, will have to be fed into the private utility companies' systems in order to be of maximum benefits.

We in turn buy from them continuous power and they will be taking advantage of the unusual value of peaking capacity. We have a very happy relationship.

What we hope is, gentlemen, you will look into this thing carefully and help us to get a small appropriation this year with which to get this project activated again. We sincerely believe that it is a going project and not a new project.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to thank you.

Mr. EVINS. This is a very interesting project.

Mr. BROOKS. May I submit two letters before I forget them? One is from the Chamber of Commerce of Port Arthur and the other is from the Chamber of Commerce of Beaumont, both of whom are interested. I would like to submit them for the record.

Mr. EVINS. They will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

BEAUMONT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Beaumont, Tex., May 9, 1955.

Congressman JACK B. BROOKS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JACK: In connection with your appearance before the Appropriations Committee on McGee Bend Dam, we would like to have it entered into the record that the Beaumont Chamber of Commerce wholeheartedly supports this project.

The Beaumont Chamber of Commerce has been a strong supporter of the Neches-Angelina Rivers project for many years. We speak for the business and professional people of the community in saying that the completion of this project is paramount in the best interests of the national economy and in the furtherance of national defense.

We feel that the McGee Bend Dam is a continuation of a project already started. The Town Bluff Dam on the Neches River is part and parcel of the McGee Bend Dam project.

We feel that the United States Government in its relations with the Lower Neches Valley Authority has a contractual obligation to complete this project because of the money that has been advanced by the Lower Neches Valley Authority in return for what it thought would be a completed project.

The Federal Government will be repaid many, many times over its investment through the increase in new taxable wealth made possible by this national resource development.

On behalf of the citizens of Beaumont and the municipal, agricultural, and industrial users of water in the entire valley, we urge your favorable consideration of our request for appropriations to continue development of the resources of the Neches and Angelina Rivers in the form of an appropriation to begin construction of McGee Bend Dam.

Sincerely,

HOWARD J. HICKS, *General Manager.*

Mr. EVINS. Congressman Brooks has spoken to me and I know to other members about this project, and he has manifested a great deal of interest in it. It has an interesting background. This whole project was approved in 1945, as I understand it.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. It was originally understood that both of these dams would be constructed and completed.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. In the meantime, the Corps of Engineers suggested a revision of the amount of contribution of the local people, and that was approved. The reregulating dam has been built, but you have only had planning money for the Big McGee Bend Dam?

Mr. BROOKS. That is right, about $850,000.

Mr. EVINS. The local people as this date are agreeable to making a contribution to see that the project goes forward as originally planned, and it is your feeling that the Federal Government has defaulted to an extent upon their original agreement?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And that regulation A–47 has made the situation more tight and more difficult?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. That is about a summary of the picture?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Is that about correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is about right.

Mr. EVINS. Tell me, you do not have firm understandings or agreements as to how this power, if produced, is to be distributed or sold?

Mr. BROOKS. There is no firm agreement.

Mr. EVINS. But you have some nebulous or tentative agreements?

Mr. BROOKS. Not quit as nebulous as indicated. The Gulf States Utility Co., a private company, has offered to buy this power. Obviously, it would fit better into their system than a small REA. The REA's are fairly large in our area, but they are small compared to the size of the utilities.

They, in good faith, on April 28, 1954, addressed a letter to the the Lower Naches Valley Authority in which they made a firm offer to purchase this power at $800,000. I will read this paragraph, which is pertinent.

However, based on data furnished to us at that time, and upon related load studies on our system, we hereby offer to purchase the entire electrical output of the McGee Bend Dam project for an annual sum of $800,000, payable in equal monthly installments, subject to the execution with appropriate governmental

authority of a mutually satisfactory agreeement, which, among other things, shall provide * * *—

and then they have some other details which are fairly reasonable, and they do include an understanding that the REA's would have a preference and would still be preference customers.

Mr. EVINS. That letter will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

GULF STATES UTILITIES COMPANY,
Beaumont, Tex., April 28, 1954.

Mr. W. F. WEED,
President, Lower Neches Valley Authority,
Beaumont, Tex.

DEAR MR. WEED: We are in full agreement that an adequate supply of fresh water is of vital importance to the Beaumont-Port Arthur area. This company realizes that its own future is substantially dependent upon the continued agricultural and industrial expansion of that area and therefore desires to cooperate to the maximum extent warranted by economic considerations in order to insure a continuous and reliable source of water supply.

Various plans have been considered over the years for the conservation of water and the incidental production of hydroelectric power on the Neches-Angelina Rivers. Some 3 months ago you approached this company and discussed the existing status of those plans and submitted certain pertinent data thereon requesting that this company study the matter with a view to making a concrete offer to purchase the hydroelectric power output as then projected. Subsequently, we discussed details of the project with both the Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth district in Fort Worth, Tex., and with the Federal Power Commission in Fort Worth. We were advised that the latest report on the project by the Corps of Engineers had not been approved by office of Chief of Engineers. However, based on the data furnished us at that time and upon related load studies on our own system, we hereby offer to purchase the entire electrical output of the McGee Bend project for an annual sum of $800,000, payable in equal monthly installments, subject to the execution with appropriate governmental authority of a mutually satisfactory agreement, which, among other things, shall provide:

(1) That sufficient primary energy will be available to produce dependable peaking capacity of 43,000 kilowatts in any 12 months continual period for at least 1,752 hours with a maximum availability in any one month of 151.11 hours and a minimum availability of 118.99 hours.

(2) That in addition to the above dependable peaking capacity and accompanying prime energy, secondary energy of not less than 53,964,000 kilowatt-hours per year, averaged over the term of agreement, will be delivered to Gulf States Utilities Co.

(3) Generation of all energy will be as scheduled by Gulf States Utilities Co. to meet its load requirements.

(4) Delivery will be at 138,000 volts at the dam site, with the necessary step-up substation facilities to be provided by other than Gulf States Utilities Co.

(6) Scheduled maintenance outages will be coordinated with the maintenance program of Gulf States Utilities Co.

(6) Unless a mutually satisfactory agreement can be reached within a period of 3 years from the date hereof, Gulf States Utilities Co. may withdraw this offer upon 6 months' written notice.

If for any cause whatsoever the dependable peaking capacity, the primary energy and/or the secondary energy as above set forth shall not be made available to Gulf States Utilities Co., then the annual payment of $800,000 will be appropriately revised.

Yours very truly,

GULF STATES UTILITIES CO.,
By R. S. NELSON, *President.*

Mr. EVINS. It is also your view and feeling that unless this McGee Bend Dam is completed, it is not only a defaulting of the original plan, but secondly, you have expended money which has not been an economic undertaking and has been wasteful?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. BROOKS. Virtually so. About $8 million, of which $2 million was local and about $6 million was Federal to build this reregulating dam which a large part of the year is nothing but a mud lake, because you do not have a sustained flow.

Mr. EASTERLING. This dam has been completely dried up before August ever since it has been built. You can walk across in front the dam for the last 3 years since it has been built.

Mr. EVINS. How much has been spent on that in total?

Mr. EASTERLING. $7,500,000 to $8,000,0000.

Mr. HAND. In a period of the last 5 years, have you had any significant interrupations in your industrial plants there by reason of the shortage of water?

Mr. EASTERLING. We have ordered curtailment of use. We have prorated to the rice farmers. We have prorated each year to the rice acreage.

Mr. HAND. But my question was, has there been any significant interruption in your industrial plants there by reason of the shortage of water?

Mr. EASTERLING. No ignificant interruption, but there can be very easily.

Mr. HAND. You spoke about some deal with the corps which caused you to amend your local assurance. Was there any formal representation made by the corps in that connection, any exchange between your authority and the corps in writing, or otherwise, wherein they asked you to amend your assurance?

Mr. EASTERLING. I do not know. We had so many conversations. Right now, it is difficult for me to remember whether we had any correspondence about it or not. I think that the understanding was in a telephone call from the Chief's office to the president of our authority, stating the situation that had developed by the shortage of funds for public works, and if we would put up this $2 million at that time the Government could then put up enough money to where they could let a finish-up construction project.

Mr. HAND. Is there any evidence of a power shortage in the area?

Mr. EASTERLING. No; no definite power shortage.

I have a statement that I would like to submit for the record.

Mr. EVINS. It will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement is as follows:)

NECHES, ANGELINA RIVERS, TEX. (MCGEE BEND DAM)—BRIEF OF LOWER NECHES VALLEY AUTHORITY AN AGENCY OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

The Neches River with its tributary, the Angelina River, is the largest river within the State of Texas. Its annual runoff is over 5 million acre-feet and it is navigable by deep-sea vessels from the gulf up to Beaumont. In the lower valley there is located the Nation's principal oil refining and petrochemical center, also there is extensive rice culture in this area.

The whole river valley suffers from periodic winter and spring floods and serious droughts and water shortages in the summer months.

In 1945 the Congress authorized the development and control of these rivers by construction of two major multiple purpose dams each with a smaller reregulating dam. This authorization was based on an engineering study and cost estimate which was completed in 1939. The cost estimate at that time was between 28 and 29 million dollars. This study reflected that the benefits exceeded the costs by an acceptable margin.

Immediately after this authorization the Corps of Engineers began and produced a new and up-to-date engineering project report and cost estimate.

This project report was submitted to the area affected at a public meeting held in November 1946 and attended by hundreds of supporting citizens of the watershed area.

This report stated that the principal purposes of the original authorization could be accomplished by construction of one big dam on the Angelina River called McGee Bend Dam, with a small reregulating dam immediately below it which was designated dam B. It was recommended that the construction of the big dam on the upper Neches River be indefinitely deferred.

It stated that these two dams would adequately control floods in the whole lower river systems, would provide navigation benefits, a bountiful supply of fresh water and have an installed hydroelectric power capacity of 43,000 kilowatts.

This report reflected that the estimated cost of McGee Bend Dam was $43,921,500 and dam B at $6,464,000.

The Corps of Engineers reported that the benefits of the project had increased commensurate with the costs, and that their studies and reports reflected that McGee Bend Dam and dam B considered as a single operating unit produced a cost to benefits ratio of 1 to 1.44.

The 1945 authorization provided that before any element of the project be started that the State of Texas or some local interest make assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that it would contribute $5 million toward the cost of construction after the whole project was completed.

The Lower Neches Valley Authority is an agency of the State of Texas engaged in distributing the waters of the Neches River to area cities, industry and extensive rice farming. The Corps of Engineers invited the Lower Neches Valley Authority to join with the Federal Government to secure construction of the project by making the $5 million assurance. The authority agreed to do this.

Due to extensive water shortages in the industrial and agricultural area, it was decided to construct dam B first in order that its waters could serve as a temporary additional supply during and pending construction of McGee Bend Dam.

In 1947 the Corps of Engineers budgeted funds for beginning of construction of dam B in the amount of $1,300,000. In 1947 the Corps of Engineers appeared before the appropriations Committee of Congress with their records and statements of the overall cost of the McGee Bend and dam B project as reflected by the above project report of 1946, and requested funds to insure the beginning of construction of dam B as the first element of the project. Prior to this on January 30, 1947, the Lower Neches Valley Authority had made its formal assurance of the payment of $5 million toward the cost of construction ($2 million on completion of dam B and $3 million on completion of McGee Bend Dam) of the McGee Bend and dam B project and this agreement and assurance had been accepted and approved by the Secretary of War. In 1947 at the hearings before the appropriations committees these facts were fully brought out and the Congress appropriated $1,300,000 which permitted beginning of construction of dam B.

In September of 1947, after conferences with the Corps of Engineers, in order to expedite the early completion of dam B the authority amended its assurance and agreed to contribute $2 million toward the cost of construction of dam B during the period of construction and $3 million on completion of McGee Bend Dam. In 1948 the Corps of Engineers appeared before the Appropriations Committees in support of $1,800,000 for completing construction of dam B. All of the above facts were submitted to the Appropriations Committees and the appropriation was made by Congress.

With the small reregulating dam B nearing completion the Corps of Engineers following their announced procedure began laying the groundwork for starting McGee Bend Dam, without which dam B would have little value in the project.

In 1949, before completion of dam B, the Corps of Engineers appeared before the Appropriations Committees in support of their budgeted item of $200,000 for advance planning on McGee Bend Dam. This appropriation was also made. And at that time the authority paid to the Government $1,500,000 of the $2 million.

In July 1950 the authority paid the remaining $500,000 to the Government toward the cost of dam B.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In 1951 the Corps of Engineers' representative, Colonel Potter, appeared before the House Appropriations Committee and referring to the Korean war emergency and necessary curtailment of public works stated:

"I may assure the committee that this list of projects are those which we see as the next necessary and fit into the defense and essential civilian economy programs. This list reflects a considerable and drastic reduction from the number of projects we have normally had for plans. We felt that the continuation of plans on all the projects that we have planned in the past is not advisable until this defense situation is ameliorated somewhat and there is more of a prospect of getting started on the construction. However these are projects on which construction should be started."

McGee Bend Dam was among these nine projects, and $75,000 was requested for advance planning. Colonel Potter informed the committee that $850,000 had been allotted to McGee Bend Dam up to that date and that this $75,000 would practically complete the planning. He stated that they were then ready for initial contracts on the construction.

At each of these hearings on McGee Bend the committee was informed that the authority had made the assurance and agreement to contribute $3 million toward the cost of construction of McGee Bend Reservoir.

During all of these hearings and other proceedings nothing was said to indicate that the 1 to 1.44 cost to benefit ratio had been disturbed, and the Congress and the authority were aware that the cost of McGee Bend Dam would be in excess of $40 million. Certainly no one asked that the $5 million contribution of the authority be increased.

In 1953 we were definitely informed by the division engineer and the district engineer that the new methods and formulas for computation of benefits and costs attributable to hydroelectric power and water supply and directed by the Bureau of the Budget for public-works projects, when applied to the McGee Bend project created conditions which left the Corps of Engineers powerless to budget and obtain approval of further funds for the beginning of construction of McGee Bend Dam. We have waited patiently for 3 years with no new developments. Our area's growth and development, like this project, has come to a halt.

From this review it is obvious that definite commitments have been made by both the Federal Government and the authority and large sums of money and much time and work have gone into this project with the understanding and knowledge that it was authorized by Congress and the project actually under construction.

The Lower Neches Valley Authority has only limited financial resources dependent on revenues derived from the distribution and delivery of water to municipalities, industries, and agriculture. Although it is an agency of the State of Texas, it has no power to tax. By paying into this project $2 million and firmly pledging an additional $3 million the authority feels that it is irrevocably tied with the Federal Government in the program of adequately and properly developing this great river system so important to the national economy and defense.

In making these payments and commitments the authority has seriously impounded its resources and credit.

Rather than assume the position that these above-outlined commitments and agreements and the construction of dam B, which is an integral part of McGee Bend Dam, has created a condition and obligation that compels the Federal Government to proceed with this project on the basis of the original condition that the local interest contribute $5 million toward the cost of the whole project, the Authority during the past year and up to this date has joined with the engineers in a cooperative effort to work out a fair and equitable basis whereby this multiple-purpose project can proceed along the same lines and provide the same benefits as provided in the original authorization.

As stated above, the two features of this project that evidently met the requirements of the formulas for computing costs to benefits up to 1953, but now fall short of present budgetary procedures, are hydroelectric power and water supply.

The 1954 report of the Corps of Engineers states that the economic cost of the hydroelectric power amounts to $989,200 annually, the Federal Power Commission has fixed the value or benefit of the power output at $908,000 annually. The incremental project costs chargeable to power is fixed at $762,000.

The authority has employed a consulting hydroelectrical engineer who has made a comprehensive study of the power features of this project. He will

submit to you his report and statement which we believe will convince this committee that the actual value of this power to the Government amounts to $1 million annually under present conditions and within a few years it will be of a value far above $1 million annually.

The upper Neches and Angelina Valleys are in a fringe area between two private power utility companies. It is a prosperous farming, small manufacturing, and lumbering area. It is served by three large REA cooperatives. Representatives of these cooperatives will testify to the need and value of this power to them now and in the future.

The Lower Neches Valley Authority is directly interested in the water-supply features of this project. Fresh water supply is a serious problem in the lower area. The Gulf Oil Co., the Texas Co., Socony-Vacuum, Pure Oil, and Atlantic Refining Co. all have their principal oil refineries in this area. In addition to this the Nation's largest synthetic-rubber plant, and many petrochemical plants are located here. These plants process in excess of 700,000 barrels of oil daily. This is the center of the gulf coast Rice Belt. Due to water shortages the authority irrigates only 55,000 acres of rice yearly. There are over 300,000 acres of available riceland that in the future can be put into production.

Due to its wealth of natural resources, this section of the gulf coast has experienced a remarkable growth during the past 15 years. During this period the industrial and municipal water use has increased 300 percent. We know that this is just the beginning of our growth and industrial expansion. The above-named water consumers require 1 billion gallons of fresh water daily during the irrigation season. The normal flow of the river is not enough to supply this demand. Each year since dam B has been completed its reservoir has been completely emptied before the end of summer. Large additional supplies of fresh water are badly needed now, and even greater quantities will be required in the future.

At the time in 1947 when the agreement was made with the Government, the authority felt that this project as outlined in the 1946 report, and which was to cost $43 million plus for McGee Bend Dam and $6 million plus for dam B, would provide through normal operation of the reservoir for flood-control releases and hydroelectric power production, a greatly enhanced flow in the Neches River during critical water-shortage periods. The authority felt that this additional water was worth the required $5 million contribution.

As stated above, at the time of the authorization of this project in 1945 the estimated cost was $29 million. The requirement for local contribution of $5 million amounted to about 18 percent of the cost of the multiple-purpose development which would provide the desired water supply benefits.

Conditions are such in the areas affected that there is a critical need for this project now. It is obvious that there is a necessity for the Lower Neches Valley Authority to contribute more money to the project. The authority is willing to go as far as it is financially able in this respect. The authority being a nonprofit, nontaxing State agency dependent on its revenues necessarily must stay within its resources. The authority is now carrying an indebetedness of approximately $4 million, $2 million of which was incurred by the issuance of revenue bonds to pay into dam B construction.

With these facts in mind, the authority feels that the following is as fair and equitable solution of this problem as can be worked out: The authority will agree with the Federal Government that in addition to the assurance already made which requires the payment of $3 million on completion of McGee Bend Dam, it will further assure and bind itself that after such completion that it will further pay to the Government $200,000 per year for a period of 50 yeras.

Under this agreement the authority will now be paying into this project on account of a portion of the water supply benefits a total payment of $15 million. This amount is in excess of 18 percent of the present costs of dam B and McGee Bend Dam.

This offer is fair and equitable because it is equal to the 18 percent required in the original authorization and this percentage was originally based upon the relationship of benefits expected to accrue through improved water supply to the total overall benefits expected from the comprehensive project.

The Office of the Chief of Engineers has comprehensive up-to-date studies and reports on all phases of this project. They know of our appearance here and will be able to give the committee any additional information required.

Therefore on the basis that this project has already been started and the commitments and obligations that have been entered into by the Government and the authority, we believe that the Congress is the only agency with the power and authority to determine whether or not this project shall be constructed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

We, therefore, appeal to this committee to place an amendment in the civil works appropriation bill an item for beginning of construction of McGee Bend Dam. In order that substantial progress can be made in getting the work underway, we feel that the amount should be a minimum of $1 million. We will be agreeable to attaching a rider to such appropriation which shall provide that before any construction is started or any of the funds spent or obligated, that the Lower Neches Valley Authority shall in addition to the assurances already made which require the payment of $3 million on completion of McGee Bend Dam, further assure and bind itself with the proper agency of the United States Government that after such completion it will pay to the United States Government $200,000 per year for a period of 50 years.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Brooks.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you very much for your courtesy.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

SAN LORENZO CREEK PROJECT

WITNESS

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. The committee will next hear our friend and colleague, Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I appear here in the interest of an appropriation to complete certain surveys and certain preliminary work on the San Lorenzo Creek project in Alameda County, Calif.

Evidence and a formal statement were filed before this committee by the local people who were here some time ago. I believe that they filed some statements with you. I have copies.

Mr. EVINS. Testimony has been received by the committee.

Mr. MILLER. I am not going to duplicate what they have had to say.

San Lorenzo Creek rises in southern Alameda County. An original survey was undertaken and a report was made in 1938. At that time the engineers said that the ratio of cost to benefits did not warrant the spending of the money to control the flood on this creek. It ran through what was then a very rich agricultural land. The whole watershed of this creek today is one of the most intensely settled areas in southern Alameda County in the east bay area of California.

The flood dangers are still there. Three years ago a levee brook and the water overran the banks and it could have done $7 million to $8 million worth of damage to a whole new home settlement in the area. The people are conscious of that.

Shortly after that there was a law passed by the Legislature that provided for the establishment of service districts so that they could then set up their own tax authority to serve this area.

As a result of that flood the Federal Government spent about $40,000 out of emergency funds to relieve the condition. The people have voted bonds, and the control of this creek is principally underway on a cooperative basis.

The State of California, the local people, and the Federal Government in a flood control project have a certain obligation, and all we are seeking is this money to pick up part of the Federal Government's chips in the flood control of this creek. It offers a lot of problems because in the early planning stages it was thought that they

could line this creek with concrete and increase some of its gradients, open the channels where it runs into the bay. When these creeks get into the lowlands they delta out and run over a large flood plain. Those plains are used by the salt industry as dehydrating ponds. It is the basis of the chemical industry there in that area.

This one runs through a powder works that went out there early to get far out from civilization and they now find themselves on the edge of a great municipal development.

It now appears that a concrete lined ditch is going to stop the percolation of the water that supplies the wells in the flat land and is quite essential in the lower reaches of the valley. So we have to do other things in order to retain the benefits, the beneficial use of water, while we are trying to get rid of its adverse and evil effects.

In the West, water is at once the friend and the enemy of man. You cannot get along without it and at certain times of the year we get too much of it, and it does untold damage.

Now, I would like to speak off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

I may say that this is the most rapidly growing section of northern California. The local people have met all of the requirements as to financial and other contributions requested of them.

I beseech your consideration.

Mr. EVINS. There have been some budgeted funds for the San Francisco area submitted in this budget. The item for which you are requesting funds is not specifically included.

Mr. MILLER. I do not know why it is not, and that is why I have come here to make a plea for it. I realize that there may be some surplus money in those budgeted funds and they have a certain latitude in using them.

Mr. EVINS. And it is your hope if such funds are available, and if the present budget request for this area is approved, some of these funds will be used for these purposes?

Mr. MILLER. That is right. I would have no hesitancy in asking that they be raised an additional $175,000.

Mr. EVINS. As usual, you make a very appealing and persuasive argument.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much.

PAINTED ROCK DAM

WITNESSES

J. D. MANSFIELD, YUMA, ARIZ., REPRESENTING SIX IRRIGATION DISTRICTS IN ARIZONA AND ONE IN CALIFORNIA, AND THE CITY OF YUMA AND COUNTY OF YUMA, ARIZ.

R. H. McELHANEY, VICE CHAIRMAN, ARIZONA INTERSTATE STREAM COMMISSION

COL. E. S. J. ERVINE, MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, WELLTON-MOHAWK IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT

Mr. EVINS. The committee has received a request from Senator Hayden that we hear testimony of his constituents from Arizona concerning projects in that State.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, my name is J. D. Mansfield, of Yuma, Ariz. Mr. Eaton is tied up with a concurrent hearing in the Senate committee so we came ourselves.

I have with me R. H. McElhaney, who is a vice chairman of the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, and was a former president of the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District of Wellton; and Col. E. S. J. Ervine, who is a member of the board of directors of the district.

We appear here today in an effort to use our time with you gentlemen to our best advantage. I have been authorized to spread for six irrigation districts in Arizona and one in California, which is somewhat unusual, as well as the city of Yuma and the county of Yuma, on the appropriation for Painted Rock Dam.

I think it might be best to file first for the record a prepared statement and then I could highlight the statement.

Mr. EVINS. The statement will be received and we will be pleased to have you highlight your statement.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

JOINT STATEMENT OF WELLTON-MOHAWK IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, YUMA COUNTY WATER USERS ASSOCIATION, UNIT B IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, NORTH GILA VALLEY IRRIGATION DISTRICT, YUMA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, YUMA MESA IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, ALL LOCATED IN ARIZONA, CITY OF YUMA, ARIZ., AND IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT LOCATED IN CALIFORNIA, IN SUPPORT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMPLETION OF PLANNING AND INITIATION OF CONSTRUCTION BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS OF PAINTED ROCK DAM LOCATED ON GILA RIVER

The following statement is joined in by the irrigation districts and political subdivisions of the States of Arizona and California, as follows:

The Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District which is located in Arizona on the Gila River approximately 40 miles east of the city of Yuma, Ariz. It is a reclamation project upon which construction is almost complete at an approximate cost of $42 million and contains 75,000 irrigable acres of farmland.

The Yuma County Water Users Association, representing the Yuma project, is one of the oldest reclamation projects on the Colorado river and contains approximately 50,000 irrigable acres in the Yuma Valley directly west and south of the city of Yuma. A part of this same project is located in the State of California and covers about 15,000 acres of Indian land and privately owned lands. That area is directly north of the city of Yuma, Ariz.

The Imperial Irrigation District, located in the Imperial Valley of California and at the present time has under cultivation and irrigation approximately 600,000 acres.

Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, Unit B Irrigation and Drainage District, North Gila Valley Irrigation District, and the Yuma Irrigation District are irrigation districts located in the area adjacent to Yuma Ariz., and contain approximately 43,000 irrigable acres.

The purpose of this joint presentation of the districts and political subdivisions of Arizona and California is to urge the following appropriations to the Secretary of the Army for use by the Corps of Engineers on the completion of plans and initiation of construction of Painted Rock Dam Reservoir on the Gila River during the coming year. The requested appropriations are as follows:

1 $90,000 which is in the budget request before the committee for completion of planning.

2. $1,000,000 for construction work during the coming fiscal year.

3. $25,000 for preliminary investigations and surveys for the downstream channel.

Before we discuss the details of the requested appropriations, may we point out that the appearance of these organizations from Arizona and California before the committee is unusual and somewhat different from the testimony this committee usually receives from interested organizations and individuals. Or-

dinarily requests for flood-control purposes are from organizations and individuals who have built or otherwise encroached on hazardous areas and in turn they ask for certain types of flood-control assistance from the United States. In our case that is not true. Our hazards and dangers have been increased by action taken by the United States.

Article 12a of the United States' Water Treaty of 1944 with Mexico required that Mexico construct, within a period of 5 years from the date of the treaty, a diversion structure in the Colorado River below the point where the international land boundary line intersects the Colorado River. The Morales Dam was constructed by Mexico pursuant to the treaty and was completed in 1950, that being within 5 years from the effective date of the treaty with Mexico. All companion works necessary for flood control in connection therewith were to be built by the United States in this country with a certain cost-sharing ratio with Mexico. Studies by the organization charged with carrying out the treaty, that is, the International Boundary and Water Commission, were undertaken in collaboration with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Geological Survey. Those studies showed that without flood control on the lower Gila River a peak discharge of 310,000 cubic feet per second could be expected to occur in the lower Colorado River at Yuma, Ariz.

On May 6, 1950, the International Boundary and Water Commission representing Mexico and the United States, reached an agreement whereby levees would be constructed along the lower Colorado River to contain a peak flow of 310,000 second-feet. The cost of such work was to be shared between the United States and Mexico pursuant to pertinent provisions of the treaty. Shortly afterward the Congress of the United States, by the act of May 17, 1950, authorized the construction of Painted Rock Dam on the lower Gila River in Arizona as a flood-control measure. This dam would reduce the maximum probable flood discharge at Yuma, Ariz., in the lower Colorado River to 140,000 cubic feet per second and would also provide a greater degree of protection than levees alone. For this reason the United States and Mexico have constructed jointly the lower Colorado River levee system and its design, and construction based upon the immediate construction of Painted Rock Dam as authorized by Congress and the resulting reduction in the peak flow at Yuma, Ariz., to 140,000 second-feet. We are now placed in the position where Morales Dam was completed according to the treaty and placed into operation in 1950, but the companion Painted Rock Dam which the United States is obligated to build is not yet under construction.

Since the authorization of the construction of Painted Rock Dam by the Congress of United States, the Wellton-Mohawk Division of the Gila project has been constructed along the lower reaches of the Gila River. Its main canal system, as well as the lateral distribution system, has also been engineered and designed upon the basis that Painted Rock Dam would be constructed as authorized by Congress on May 17, 1950. This project by midsummer of this year will have almost two-thirds of its acreage under irrigation. It is developing at a more rapid pace than was thought possible at the time the original studies were made on Painted Rock Dam. This one development alone represents an investment of some $42 million by the irrigation district, not to mention at least $25 million which have been invested by the farmers in developing their lands and building their homes in the community.

As has been brought out in this hearing and earlier hearings, the disastrous 1916 flood on the lower Colorado River was occasioned very largely by discharges from the Gila River into the Colorado at their point of confluence just above Yuma, Ariz. If a major flood occurred prior to the construction of Painted Rock Dam, the following results could very easily happen. The new Wellton-Mohawk Division of the Gila project would have a major portion of its carriage and distribution system completely washed out and ruined. The flood would then proceed downstream and inundate the areas encompassed within the North Gila Irrigation District and the Yuma Irrigation District, both of which are located near the confluence of the Gila and Colorado Rivers. Because of the difference in gradient of the two rivers, great amounts of debris and other solid material would be deposited at that point. The result of such deposits would be to breach the present inadequate levee system as constructed by the United States and Mexico, and spread the river into the cultivated Indian lands, as well as the privately owned lands in that portion of the Yuma project located in California. It would also breach the main canal system of the Yuma project. This association serves approximately 50,000 acres with irrigation water.

The levee system protecting the city of Yuma and the Yuma Valley would also be breached and thereby flood extensive urban and rural improvements. Pos-

sibly the river would develop a new channed and bypass Mexico's Morales Dam. If such a flood should reach into the Volcanic Lake area of the lower Colorado River delta, it would damage the All-America Canal syphon across the New River in Imperial Valley, Calif., as well as the All-American and West Side main canal of the Imperial Irrigation District. The breaching of the All-Amer- supply of irrigation water to a minimum of 90,000 acres in the Imperial Irrigation District. This interruption of supply could result in the loss of the entire crop of that acreage.

To briefly recapitulate, a major flood, by destroying the main canal systems of the projects listed above, could cut off the irrigation water supply to approximately 245,000 acres of land. Based upon current average crop values of $300 per acre, the loss from this one phase alone would be approximately $73,500. This does not take into consideration the other physical damages which would come as a result of such a flood to farmlands, buildings, canal systems, and urban improvements in and adjacent to the city of Yuma, Ariz.

Therefore, it is readily apparent that the immediate construction of Painted Rock Dam is essential if these large flood-damage losses are to be prevented. As stated earlier, the United States has contributed to the increase of this hazard and danger. In fairness to the people and organizations that have made millions upon millions of dollars of investments in these areas, United States should proceed at the greatest possible speed with the completion of planning and begin construction upon Painted Rock Dam this year. With a minimum 4 to 5 years for construction of the dam, it would be 1959 or 1960 before it could be placed into operation. This would be 10 years from the date when the need of this work was greatly increased by action taken by United States.

As a further example of the immediate need for initiation of construction work, many lending institutions are desirous and willing to loan development capital to bring in new lands. However, they have stated that due to flood hazards, those loans must be deferred until such time as actual construction of Painted Rock Dam has begun.

The appropriaton of the $90,000 requested in the budget before the committee will allow completion of planning early in the coming fiscal year. The appropriation of $1 million for construction would permit the construction of access roads and campsite as well as provide a start on real-estate acquisition almost immediately. The $25,000 appropriation would allow the preliminary investigations and surveys of the downstream channel to begin promptly. We sincerely and respectfully request favorable action on these requests.

Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, by Frank Batley, President; Yuma County Water Users Association, by Ernest J. Johannsen, President; Imperial Irrigation District, by Evan T. Hewes, President; Unit B Irrigation and Drainage District, by G. C. Morse, President; North Gila Valley Irrigation District, by Frank M. Ferguson, President; Yuma Irrigation District, by Lee S. Bradley, President; Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, by John Gardner, President; City Yuma, Ariz., by Hugh Faulds, Mayor; County of Yuma, Ariz., by G. H. Strohm, Chairman, Board of Supervisors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I represent, as I said before, six irrigation districts, all of which are on the Gila River as well as at the confluence of the Gila and Colorado Rivers just above Yuma.

Congressman Jensen of the subcommittee is quite familiar with our project. We worked with him quite a few years and I know he is familiar with the physical details of it.

There is also joined with us the Imperial Irrigation District on the west side of the Colorado River below the confluence of the Gila River and the Colorado River. They are equally concerned with the flood dangers that now exist because of lack of flood control on the Gila River.

At the outset I would like to point this out, because we appear before this committee, I believe, in a most unusual position. Ordinarily people come before the committee requesting funds for flood control because there has been an encroachment on the flood plain. In our case

that is not true. The dangers and hazards which we have today have been increased by a treaty entered into between the United States and the Republic of Mexico and actions which have been taken under that treaty. I would like to make that point particularly clear so that it is understandable.

In 1944 the United States and Mexico negotiated a water treaty. It was a water treaty which effected the division of waters of the Colorado River as well as the Rio Grande River.

Under article 12a of the treaty the Republic of Mexico was required to construct a dam in the Colorado River. They had to construct this dam within a period of 5 years from the date of the treaty, so that that dam had to be completed by 1950. The dam, which is known as the Morelos Dam, has been built on the Colorado River just below the city of Yuma, just a few miles downstream after the confluence of the Colorado and Gila Rivers. This dam was placed in operation in 1950.

By this same treaty which the United States entered into with Mexico, this was required to be done under article 13 of the treaty. The treaty itself set up the International Boundary and Water Commission. There is a Commissioner for the American section and a Commissioner for the Mexican section. They have joint engineering staffs. Article 13 required the Commission to study, investigate, and prepare plans for flood control on the lower Colorado River between Imperial Dam and the Gulf of Mexico in both the United States and Mexico, and further required the Commission, in a minute, to refer to the two Governments their report as to the work to be constructed by each Government. The minute, of course, is an agreement that is signed by both parties and is supplemental to the treaty. This is the important part:

> The two Governments agree to construct through their respective sections of the Commission such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments, each Government to pay the cost of the works constructed by it.

Then it goes into the operation and maintenance of the works.

The treaty was ratified by the United States and went in effect in 1945. Mexico constructed Morelos Dam, which went into operation in 1950.

Shortly prior to that time, and pursuant to the treaty, Mexico and the United States, through their joint engineering staffs, prepared a study of the Colorado River, particularly of that section below the confluence of the Gila River. Those studies showed—by the way, the Corps of Engineers as well as the Bureau of Reclamation and the Geological Survey participated in those studies—that without flood control on the lower Gila River a peak discharge of 310,000 second-feet could be expected to occur in the lower Colorado River at Yuma, Ariz.

So on May 6, 1950, pursuant to this treaty, the International Boundary and Water Commission, representing Mexico and the United States, reached an agreement whereby levees would be constructed along the lower Colorado River to contain a peak flow of 310,000 second-feet, and the cost of such work was to be shared between the United States and Mexico. The United States was to construct it. Mexico took its money and deposited it in a bank in the United States and the work was to proceed.

On May 17, 1950, the Congress of the United States authorized the construction of Painted Rock Dam on the lower Gila River in Arizona as a flood-control measure. This dam would reduce the maximum probable flood discharge at Yuma in the lower Colorado River to 140,000 second-feet and would also provide a greater degree of protection than levees alone.

After this was done the two engineering staffs got together and by appropriate minutes reduced the design of the levee system to contain the flow of 140,000 second-feet, based upon the immediate construction of Painted Rock Dam. The dam was authorized and planning work began on it.

Prior to that time and as of now the levee systems have been built to contain this flow of 140,000 second-feet, but it is a little bit of a horse before the cart because upstream we do not have Painted Rock Dam constructed yet.

The appropriation request now before the committee for $90,000 will allow completion of planning for the construction of Painted Rock Dam. The field district engineer tells us that the planning work could be completed probably within the first 4 months of the coming fiscal year and that they would then be in a position to proceed with their construction work. In the budget you have before you there is an item of $90,000 to complete the planning.

Our purpose in appearing for the 6 irrigation districts in Arizona, as well as the 1 in California and the city of Yuma, is to request the committee to appropriate $1 million for the construction work to begin during the coming fiscal year as well as $25,000 for preliminary investigations and studies of the channel below Painted Rock.

As I say, we are in this position. Under the treaty Morelos Dam has been built. The plug is in the river, and the levees have been built. So we have the plug in the river and the levee system, but Painted Rock is still in the planning stage. So we are requesting that construction work be begun during the coming fiscal year on Painted Rock Dam. Assuming construction began during the coming fiscal year, at best it would be either 4 or 5 years before the closure is actually made in the Gila River. So if we start today we know we have 5 years of peril before us, but we know that in 5 years the closure would be made.

The 1916 flood on the lower Colorado River was occasioned very largely by discharges from the Gila River into the Colorado at their point of confluence just above Yuma. If another major flood occurred prior to the construction of Painted Rock Dam, the new Wellton-Mohawk division of the Gila project would have a major portion of its carriage and distribution system completely washed out. The flood would then proceed downstream and inundate the areas within the North Gila Irrigation District and the Yuma Irrigation District, both of which are located near the confluence of the Gila and Colorado Rivers. Because of the difference in gradient of the two rivers, large amounts of debris and other material would be deposited at that point, resulting in a breach of the present levee system and spreading the river into the cultivated Indian lands as well as privately owned lands in the portion of the Yuma project located in California. It would also breach the main canal system of the Yuma project.

The levee system protecting the city of Yuma and the Yuma Valley would also be breached and extensive urban and rural improvements would be flooded. Possibly the river would develop a new channel and bypass Morelos Dam. If such a flood should reach into the Volcano Lake area of the lower Colorado River Delta, it would damage the All-American Canal siphon across the New River Imperial Valley, Calif., as well as the All-American and West Side Main Canal of the Imperial Irrigation District. The breaching of the All-American Canal or the West Side Main Canal would result in the interruption in the supply of irrigation water to a minimum of 90,000 acres in the Imperial Irrigation District. This interruption in the water supply could result in the loss of the entire crop of that acreage.

All told, a major flood could cut off the irrigation water supply to approximately 245,000 acres of land. Out there our crop yields are quite high, approximately $300 per acre, so that the loss to crops alone from 1 flood would be approximately $73,500,000 in the 1 year.

That is why in our situation 1 year makes quite a lot of difference because it could wipe out the entire capital investment as well as the crops.

We are in this situation not necessarily because of acts of our own, and we are here to ask the United States to carry out as rapidly as possible the obligations assumed by the treaty of 1945. This is not a case of our encroaching on the flood plan. This is a case where the United States has contributed to the increase of the hazard and danger.

I have Mr. McElhaney and Colonel Ervine with me. They plan to make no statements. If any of you have any questions I shall try to answer them.

Mr. EVINS. In other words, the treaty was entered into in 1945 and under the terms of the treaty this project would go forward provided it was approved by the respective governments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And our Government has approved that project because in 1950 the Painted Rock Dam project was authorized?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And the project is advancing on schedule and money is in the budget for additional planning, but what you are complaining about is, it is not moving fast enough?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are not complaining. We are saying the construction phase of it could begin in about 4 months after the beginning of the next fiscal year and thereby save at least 8 months' time.

Mr. EVINS. So you are asking $1 million for construction work at this time and you point out that the appropriation of this amount might result in saving the capital investment plus crops?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. You made a very fine statement.

Mr. MURRAY. Is there not a lawsuit pending in the United States Supreme Court concerning the construction of the terms of that treaty between the United States and Mexico?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not in this regard. The only question in the suit between Arizona and California concerns water out of Lake Mead.

Mr. MURRAY. That litigation has nothing to do with this project?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not Painted Rock Dam. In fact, the plaintiff and defendant in that lawsuit—the Imperial Irrigation District of Cali-

fornia and the State of Arizona—have both joined in this statement. So I think that is the best answer I can give you.

Mr. MURRAY. That litigation would have no effect on the water rights of anyone involved in this project so that there might be some question as to planning?

Mr. MANSFIELD. This has only to do with the flood control as such.

Mr. MURRAY. It has nothing to do with irrigation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, sir.

Mr. JENSEN. Have you folks made a like statement to the one you have just made to this committee regarding the need and urgency for the beginning of construction to the Army engineers?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; we have met with them.

Mr. JENSEN. When?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We met with Colonel Frye in the middle of April or latter part of March after the budget was in.

Mr. JENSEN. After the budget was submitted?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. We understand the work in the field is done approximately a year before the time it comes before the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And we were under the impression that the appropriation made last year for planning would have placed them in a position where work would have commenced this year.

Mr. JENSEN. Do they agree they can finish their advance planning in the first 4 months of fiscal year 1956?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. We have a letter which says they can economically use $1 million for construction during the next fiscal year.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you have that letter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senator Hayden has it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that letter be made a part of the record.

Mr. EVINS. If Senator Hayden has such a letter we will be very happy to receive it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will submit it for the record.

(The following letter was submitted for the record:)

MARCH 14, 1955.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of March 1, 1955, requesting information pertaining to the authorized Painted Rock Dam and Whitlow Ranch Reservoir projects, and the investigations of the Buttes Dam and the Globe-Miami flood-control problems. You were advised by letter of March 4, 1955, that the information requested would be forwarded as soon as practicable. The information you desire is set forth on the attached enclosures.

I trust that the data enclosed will be adequate for your needs. Should you desire any additional information, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Brigadier General, USA, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

PAINTED ROCK RESERVOIR, ARIZ.

1. Date of authorization: 1950 Flood Control Act.
2. Total estimated cost:
   Federal—$35,000,000.
   Local—Local interests are required to (1) adjust all claims concerning water rights that might result from the improvement, and (2) keep the

flood channel of Gila River downstream from the dam free from encroachment.

3. Benefit-to-cost ratio: 1.56 to 1.
4. Amounts available to date:
   Planning, $329,000.
   Construction, none.
5. Amounts included in President's Budget for fiscal year 1956:
   Planning, $90,000.[1]
   Construction, none.
6. Amounts which could be profitably expended in fiscal year 1956:

The President's budget estimate for fiscal year 1956 allocates $90,000 to the Painted Rock Reservoir project for completion of the preconstruction planning required on this project. However, planning will be sufficiently advanced on this project at the end of the present fiscal year to enable construction to be initiated in fiscal year 1956. Funds in the amount of $1 million could be economically expended in that fiscal year. These funds would enable completion of the preconstruction planning, and the initiation of work during the later half of the year on the land acquisition and the relocations programs.

Mr. JENSEN. This has been a very worthwhile project. I shall not go on record either favoring or not favoring your $1 million request at this time, but I think it would be helpful if we had the Army engineers' idea on this matter.

NEW MEXICO PROJECTS

WITNESSES

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO
JOHN PATRICK MURPHY, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION
HUBERT BALL, CHIEF ENGINEER, MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear next Congressman Dempsey, of New Mexico, a senior, able, and valued Member of Congress, and a member of the Public Works Committee. We always are glad to hear Governor Dempsey.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate your courtesy in giving me this appointment.

The specific matter for which I asked an appointment has to do with two very bad floods in the vicinity of Roswell, N. Mex. Unfortunately we had the flood-control project approved by the budget, approved by the Congress, but we needed some advance engineering. The Army engineers appeared before the Bureau of the Budget and made a request for the amount of money they thought would be necessary throughout the country. The budget reduced it, then they distributed as best they could the amounts they could allocate to the various States.

At Roswell, N. Mex., and Artesia, N. Mex., last October 15 people were drowned and nearly $10 million damage was done to farms and residential areas by floods. We have a bomber base there which cost

[1] The budget transmitted to Congress on January 17, 1955, includes $5 million for advance engineering and design on a number of Corps of Engineers projects. Within this overall amount there is tentatively allocated at the present time $90,000 for the Painted Rock Reservoir project. Some modification of these tentative allocations may, of course, be required, based on actual appropriations made in the Department of the Army Civil Functions Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1956, and review of developments between now and the time that act is passed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

about $115 million. This is the second time a flood has occurred in the last year.

We need first to get the advance engineering to enable the Army engineers to make detailed planning. I have here a letter from General Itschner, who gave me the estimated cost of the planning work necessary. The Army engineers allocated for Albuquerque and Roswell and Artesia $135,000 from the $5 million advance planning funds approved by the budget.

I did not find out very early from the Director of the Budget what was allocated for these two projects. I talked to Mr. Hughes directly and he said he did not know, but he did know something about the projects. I got the information from the Army engineers that $135,000 was allocated to both projects and under that allocation it would take 4 years at Roswell to get the engineering work done in an area where 15 lives were lost last year.

I think when you are facing a potentially dangerous flood situation there is never any money saved by deferring flood control, and especially in a city which is the second or third largest city in New Mexico.

I would like to say to the Army engineers that Congress wants them to proceed as early as possible. Mr. Hughes called me back—he was leaving for Europe—and said he had checked into the situation and was fully satisfied he wants us to get $115,000 additional. He said he or someone from his office would call members of the Appropriations Committee and talk to them about it. He left and I believe Mr. Belcher did call.

I would like to offer for the record General Itschner's letter.

Mr. EVINS. It will be received and inserted in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington 25, D. C., March 8, 1955.

Hon. JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEMPSEY: On March 3 you telephoned asking for information as to the plans for three local protection projects; those for Roswell, for Artesia, and the Sandia diversion at Albuquerque. You asked for information on the planning allocation proposed for fiscal year 1956, and the maximum amount that might be effectively used in that year.

As you know, these three projects were authorized by the 1954 Flood Control Act. No allocation has been possible to date for either planning or construction. The Two Rivers Reservoir for the protection of Roswell has an estimated cost of $6,050,000. A total of $205,000 would be required to bring the project to construction readiness. A total of up to $100,000 as a maximum might be used in the first year of planning. The local protection project for Artesia has an estimated cost of $570,000 and it would cost $50,000 to bring it to construction status. On an expedited schedule, this entire amount might be expended in 1 year. The Sandia diversion project at Albuquerque, having an estimated cost of $7,500,000, could have one element brought to construction readiness by the expenditure of $230,000. Up to $100,000 might be expended in the first year of planning.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1956 carries an allowance nationwide of $5 million for advanced engineering and design on Corps of Engineers projects. From this amount tentative allocation has been made of $50,000 to the Two Rivers Reservoir, $25,000 to the Artesia local protection works, and $60,000 to the Sandia diversion.

I trust the above information will meet your needs.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Brigadier General, U. S. A., Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Mr. DEMPSEY. This would provide the amount necessary for the advance engineering and that is all I am asking in regard to these two projects.

Mr. EVINS. I will say we have had testimony as to the need for work in this area and, as was indicated, funds are in the budget. Your position is that the amount in the budget is not sufficent to speed the project alon?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And the statement from General Itschner s that they could use the entire amount you are requesting?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am asking for exactly the same amount General Itschner said they could use to expedite the work. He said he could not tell me what they asked for because it is against the rules, but he could tell me how much they would like to use.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. EVINS. How much local participation has gone into this work?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Far beyond the ordinary. The project is $6.5 million and was very high in local participation, both this one and the one n Albuquerque. I think in Albuquerque it was about 30 percent of the project.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad that you have this letter from General Itschner, which explains the position of the Army engineers on this matter. I know, of course, of the flood problems that you have in New Mexico. I also know that it is almost a crime to see that water, which is liquid gold to that State, rush to the sea.

The only thing that can be said about the State of New Mexico so far as allocation for flood control is concerned is that it has received less than other States from the taxpayers of America. I do not know why but that is the fact.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think the reason is that nearly 50 percent of the State is owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. JENSEN. That may be one of the reasons. I am sure the project which you have just addressed yourself to is a very worthy project and I assure you, as one member of the committee, it will receive my sympathetic consideration.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have two gentlemen here, Mr. John Patrick Murphy, who represents the Middle Rio Grande Flood Control Association, and Mr. Hubert Ball, chief engineer of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District.

In New Mexico we have two Congressmen and we both run at large so we both cover the entire State. Albuquerque is the largest city in New Mexico and one of the fastest growing cities, comparatively speaking, in the United States.

Mr. EVINS. I want to state for the record that Congressman Fernandez, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, expressed his interest in this and was to be heard but was tied up in another committee.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am here at his request.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Murphy, you may proceed.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is John Patrick Murphy and I am executive secretary of the Middle Rio Grande Flood Control Association. I have been author-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ized by the board of directors of this association to appear on their behalf and present their views in support of the Bureau of Reclamation program for continuation of the work on the Rio Grande project; and for the Army engineers who are authorized to construct the flood-control phase of this coordinated comprehensive plan.

This project was authorized for appropriations in 1948. However, at that time, the Budget Bureau incorrectly classified the reclamation phase of the work as a "new start" instead of a rehabilitation and water salvaging program. Therefore, from year to year, nothing was recommended in the budget for the Bureau of Reclamation phase of our project. We did, however, receive some emergency money in the years 1952 and 1953 amounting to $3,513,000.

Finally, in fiscal year 1954, the House Subcommittee on Reclamation Appropriations recognized that our project was not a new start and followed through on their convictions by appropriating $1,630,889 with which to start construction work on our long delayed rehabilitation program. The Senate concurred in this action. Then last year the Congress appropriated $2 million with which to continue this important work.

During the past 3 years of this rehabilitation program by the Bureau of Reclamation, they estimate that savings in water have already amounted to over 100,000 acre-feet. This was channeled through the San Marcial swamps into Elephant Butte Reservoir where it was sorely needed. In dollar value, on the basis of a minimum of $35 per acre-foot, they evaluate the savings thus far as worth over $3,500,000 to the lower valley of New Mexico and Texas. They further believe that these savings may go as high as 40,000 acre-feet of water per year, as the program advances.

At this point, I would like to explain briefly the importance of getting water through the Middle Valley and into Elephant Butte Reservoir for use by the lower valley: under the terms of the Rio Grande Compact, the middle valley is obligated to deliver certain quantities of water to the lower valley.

Because of unforeseen water losses which have developed in our river channel since the framing of this compact, coupled with 11 continuous years of drought, we can no longer meet our compact obligations. The consequent penalty—though it is no fault of ours—is that we have been forced to open the gates on our only storage dam in the middle valley and let the water flow through to Elephant Butte Reservoir in the lower valley. We are now faced with the impossible task of trying to operate an irrigation district without water other than from rainfall in a semiarid country.

This debit situation to the lower valley and Texas can be alleviated through saving of water now being lost by poor drainage conditions within the middle Rio Grande project lands and along the river channel, and by the elimination of the salt-cedar infestations.

For fiscal year 1956, the Bureau of Reclamation requested a total of $3,919,000 for its phase of construction work on our Rio Grande project.

The Interior Department realizes how urgent this rehabilitation work is to the States of Texas and New Mexico because the sooner the water-salvaging program is completed and our water supply stabilized, the sooner we can pay our water debt to the lower valley,

and thence start storing the essential water in El Vado Reservoir for use in our own irrigation district.

The work of restoring the agricultural facilities of this important area can no longer be postponed without serious deterioration of the valley's ability to support its established economy and its ever increasing population.

The Budget Bureau has approved $3,500,000 for the continuation of this important rehabilitation program, which—although it is $419,000 short of the amount requested—still, it is enough, so that we can proceed in an orderly fashion. We are sure this committee will not cut this figure.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I would now like to present the Army engineers flood-control phase of our coordinated project.

Population in the middle Rio Grande Valley is conservatively estimated at 450,000 with property valuation in the flood-plain area placed at $500 million.

There are 6,000 Indians in this valley living in 9 pueblos: Agriculture is the principal economy of these Indians, and now their homes and farms are being seriously threatened, along with their valley neighbors.

New Mexico is also one of the most vital areas in the national-defense program. Some of these installations include: Los Alamos Atomic Laboratories, Sandia Atomic Laboratories, Sandia Armed Forces special weapons project, Kirtland Air Force Base, Ordnance Research Division, guided-missiles project, experimental range, and so forth.

This year the Budget Bureau included only $1,600,000 in construction money for the Army engineers. This is earmarked for the continued construction of levees on the Rio Grande Floodway, Albuquerque unit. And $75,000 planning money for Abiquiu Dam.

However, this is only half the problem. Our first and paramount need is for dams in addition to the levees.

Only by dams can the maximum flow of water be held below the stage at which flood damage begins.

Only by dams can the silting and raising of the riverbed be stopped.

An exhaustive study by some of the most highly qualified engineers in our Government has stated for the record that a flood in the middle Rio Grande is inevitable if we do not hurry and complete the essential dams.

If a maximum flood of record in the year 1884, or even the flood of 1920 or 1929, were repeated, the floodwaters would come rushing down into densely populated areas around Albuquerque with little warning. Loss of life and property damage would be heavy. And, if the river were to get out of its channel above Albuquerque it would unquestionably make inoperative, in whole or in part, all of the utilities such as telephone and telegraph, water supply, sewage disposal, power and light plants, the railroads and highways, and so forth.

It is impossible to predict when a flood of this nature might occur, so—I think it should be considered in the light of its effect on national defense, because a flood could very easily occur at a time of national emergency when it would be imperative for the security of the country that Sandia Base, Kirkland Field, and Los Alamos be capable of com-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

plete and uninterrupted operation. That these installations would be adversely affected is certain for they depend for their utilities, communications, railroad service, fuel supplies, and so forth on facilities which are located in the valley.

We are now in the 11th year of a prolonged drought in our area, and some people are becoming apathetic. But we should not let the drought give us a false sense of security.

The coming of a flood awaits only the combination of natural conditions which will bring down the river the same amount of water that has come down many times in the past.

We must expedite the construction of our dams. The extreme flood danger to the middle Rio Grande Valley cannot be eliminated merely by building levees and straightening the river channel. Dams are the essential part of the comprehensive plan. The Army engineers would like to take advantage of this drought season to build the essential dams before a flood occurs.

Therefore, the Albiquin Dam on the Chama River is urgently needed in the interest of flood and sediment control on the Rio Grande. The Chama River is the largest flood and sediment producing tributary on the Rio Grande in New Mexico above the city of Albuquerque. The Abiquin Dam would control approximately two-thirds of the Chama watershed and greatly reduce the flood peaks on the Rio Grande and flow of sediment from the watershed. Its construction would substantially increase the degree of flood protection in the middle valley, which is now provided only by the existing levees and levees currently under construction.

The Army engineers have told us that they can get Abiquin Dam started this 1956 fiscal year.

The general design memo has been completed and work on the detailed design memo for the outlet works has been initiated. This design memo and plans and specifications could be completed within the first 6 months of fiscal year 1956, which would permit award of a construction contract for the outlet works about February 1, 1956.

They could beneficially use an additional $500,000 for initiating construction on this urgently needed dam. Of this amount, approximately $70,000 would be required in acquisition of necessary real estate and approximately $430,000 utilized on a continuing contract for the outlet works to be awarded on or about February 1, 1956.

An additional appropriation therefore, in the amount of $500,000 earmarked for Abiquin Dam would permit the Army engineers to award the first construction contract in fiscal year 1956, and, contingent on funds being made available in subsequent fiscal years, this project could be completed in 4½ years.

Thus, the foregoing program would enable the Army engineers to proceed in an efficient manner and maintain the schedule of work that they feel should be accomplished.

It must be realized that the people in New Mexico are disturbed and worried over the length of time it has already taken to construct the small unit referred to as Jemez Dam and the levee work now under construction above the city of Albuquerque.

Also, they are impatient, and justly so, because of the fact that continuous curtailment of the funds by the Congress for this project is resulting in constantly increasing costs. This, added to the ever-pres-

ent threat of a possible flood occurring before the dams are constructed, creates a situation in their minds which is bad, to say the least.

In my appearance here today before this very important Subcommittee on Appropriations, I really feel I am discussing New Mexico's problems with sympathetic friends who will help us. Hence, I urgently request that you provide the maximum amount of funds for this worthy and vitally needed project.

In closing, I want to thank you on behalf of the 450,000 splendid, but anxious people whom I represent, and to say that we appreciate very much this opportunity to appear before you and plead our cause.

Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Murphy. You made a very challenging statement.

What is the situation with respect to Texas and New Mexico's compact? What are you required to do and what is the state of the progress?

Mr. MURPHY. In the construction of our Rio Grande project it has to comply with the compact as signed between Colorado, Texas, and New Mexico, and when I refer to the lower valley that is what we call the Mesilla Valley in lower New Mexico, and the irrigation district which is centered in El Paso, Tex.

In order to expedite the carrying out of the terms of the compact, Elephant Butte south is considered Texas, from there north to the Colorado line is referred to as New Mexico, and from there up is referred to as Colorado. Each State has a compact commissioner. The water is measured as it comes through from Colorado and we have to send a certain percentage of that water on through to the lower valley according to the compact, but due to certain conditions brought about by denuding the mountainside through lumbering, grazing and other things, Albuquerque is sitting there with nothing but quicksand levees and water in the riverbed is 4 feet higher than the city itself, so it is a precarious position for Albuquerque. The levees are not going to do us any good without the dams. It seems there is too much concentration on levees and not enough on the construction of the dams, and the only reason the Army engineers give us for not following the recommended program is that they are always held down to a minimum in requesting appropriations so that they have to ask for peanuts instead of the urgently needed dollars.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You asked about the compact. We are charged by Texas with being in violation of the compact. It is not because we used one barrel of water from the Rio Grande that did not belong to us, but because the channel filled up at one part of the river 26 feet in 20 years, so that we could not get the water through even if we had a heavy rainfall. It overflowed the stream banks—where there were any—and destroyed property. The Rio Grande is an international stream.

Mr. EVINS. So the central group of necessity had to dredge or build a canal?

Mr. DEMPSEY. They are dredging now. They have done quite a good job in the last several years, under the committee of which Mr. Jensen was chairman, in getting the channel open.

Mr. MURPHY. That is the Bureau of Reclamation phase of it.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. DEMPSEY. We did not have the money to do it ourselves. It is an international stream and we always had difficulty getting sufficient money to do the job.

Mr. EVINS. Tell the committee how much could be wisely expended on this project in the next fiscal year.

Mr. MURPHY. If we had an additional $500,000 to start work on Abiquiu Dam the plans would be completed in the first 6 months of the next fiscal year and the first contract for the outlet works could be let on February 1, 1956.

Mr. EVINS. $500,000 in addition to what is in the budget?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes. And contingent on funds being made available in subsequent fiscal years we can complete Abiquiu Dam in 4½ years.

Mr. JENSEN. I can only say that Mr. Murphy has explained the conditions that exist on the Rio Grande very ably and well. It is a terrific problem, a problem which has been a most worrisome thing for many years. I hope as soon as possible we can get this problem solved.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would like to point out one thing. I am a member of the Atomic Energy Committee. The Sandia atomic energy installations that Mr. Murphy has pointed out to you is a project closely allied with Los Alamos and bears the same security restrictions as Los Alamos. There are thousands of employees working there and it is a very important project.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Now if you will hear from Mr. Ball.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Ball, we shall be pleased to hear from you.

Mr. BALL. My name is Hubert Ball. I live in Albuquerque. N. Mex. I am chief engineer of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District and have been for 18 years.

I want to second all the statements made by Congressman Dempsey and Mr. Murphy, and I have two prepared statements I would like to submit for the record. The first statement is in support of continued appropriations for comprehensive development of the middle Rio Grande Valley; and the other statement requests appropriations to continue construction of various flood-control features of the middle Rio Grande project.

Mr. EVINS. Those statements will be inserted in the record.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HUBERT BALL, CHIEF ENGINEER, MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT SUPPORTING CONTINUED APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MIDDLE RIO GRANDE VALLEY

Mr. Chairman, my name is Hubert Ball and I live in Albuquerque, N. Mex. I am chief engineer of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District. The Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District was organized and operates according to laws of the State of New Mexico. The purpose of the district was to construct, operate, and maintain flood-control, drainage, and irrigation works along approximately 155 miles of the Rio Grande Valley within the central part of the State of New Mexico.

The district has been described to the Congress many times and a feasibility report recommending a comprehensive plan of development, prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers, was submitted to the Congress of the United States. Following submission of this report, the Congress authorized the comprehensive plan for the middle Rio Grande area. This authorization was accomplished through two separate legislative acts. One dated 1948 approving the plan and authorizing the expenditure of $3,500,000. The second act was passed in 1950 authorizing appropriation of funds to complete the proposed construction. This report, and the resulting authorizations, covered in detail problems connected with irrigation and flood control confronting the

State of New Mexico and particularly that part of the middle Rio Grande Valley within the jurisdiction of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District. The report pointed out that two of the most pressing problems plaguing the district were:

(1) The inequitable method of construction payments which are used to retire the outstanding bonds and also the antiquated and cumbersome system which State law requires in the collection of operation and maintenance funds by conservancy districts within the State of New Mexico.

(2) Due to the terrific silt load carried by the Rio Grande and its tributaries, the operation and maintenance of the irrigation- and river-control structures within the conservancy district had become a financially impossible burden for the local people, and, due to the aggradation of the riverbed resulting from this excessive silt load large areas within and adjacent to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District had become waterlogged and many thousand acre-feet of water was being lost in the swamped areas.

Because of continuous severe drought conditions in the Southwest, it was decided that the most desirable work which could be done immediately was a water-salvage program. With the cooperation of Congress and various Federal and local governmental agencies great progress has been made and much good has resulted from the portion of construction which is now completed.

The legislation you are now considering contains various proposed items of construction which will be carried on under the supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation and in accordance with the construction repayment contract which has been executed by the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District with the United States Government. The more important of these items are:

(1) Extension of the water-salvage program which is highly essential to the middle Rio Grande area and is exceedingly vital at this present period because of the continued severe drought condition which has persisted for the past 13 years on the Rio Grande watershed. Draining of the waterlogged areas has already returned many thousand acre-feet of water to the river channel annually and the extension of this program is almost mandatory.

This feature deserves particular attention because the recurring water shortages have been particularly discouraging to the local people attempting to operate the district within the terms of the Rio Grande compact. The entire program of the Bureau is aimed at developing a more efficient use of the water in the middle Rio sector and a reduction of natural losses in the riverbed and many adjacent sections which have been waterlogged into swamp areas because of heavy sediment deposits in the floodways of the river valley. The Bureau program also contains proposed construction of features which will alleviate the silt-removal problem in the irrigation system.

(2) The further rehabilitation of the drainage system, which is at present time a part of our water-savings program and will most certainly pay dividends at some time in the future when the drought no longer exists and we once more have normal flows along the Rio Grande and its tributaries.

(3) The reconstruction and extension of the irrigation system as contemplated in the comprehensive plan includes the completion of the repair and rehabilitation of El Vado Dam, rebuilding and rehabilitation of many miles of irrigation laterals and attendant structures. These items have all been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and were recommended in the President's message to Congress for inclusion in the reclamation appropriations.

These features proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation are all most important units of the Bureau program and I am sure will meet any feasibility test ordinarily required by reclamation projects. The Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District sincerely endorses this program and appreciates the cooperation of the Congress and Bureau of Reclamation we have enjoyed in the past. All work has been done in a workmanlike manner and in agreement with wishes of the local people. We earnestly request the project be carried to completion. We believe the $3,500,000 requested in this bill to be the minimum required to allow construction at the most economical rate.

I wish to thank this committee for the time which has been allotted to our area and once more extend to you our sincere appreciation for the past help extended to New Mexico and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO GENERAL LIBRARIES

STATEMENT OF HUBERT BALL CHIEF ENGINEER, MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT REQUESTING APPROPRIATIONS TO CONTINUE CONSTRUCTION OF VARIOUS FLOOD CONTROL FEATURES OF THE MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, my name is Hubert Hall. I am chief engineer of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District and my home is Albuquerque, N. Mex.

The Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District covers an area of approximately 240,000 acres which extends for a distance of approximately 150 miles along the Rio Grande within the central section of New Mexico. About 90 percent of this area, which includes the larger portion of the cities and towns of Albuquerque, Bernalillo, Los Lunas, Belen, and Socorro, lie within the flood plain. There is approximately 90,000 acres of farmlands presently cultivated and subject to flood damage. Included within this area are 6 Indian Pueblos of about 21,000 acres which are extremely susceptible to flood damage during periods of high runoff on the Rio Grande. Public utilities and water supplies used by various Government defense installations are located within the flood plain and would suffer severe damage in any flood which might happen within the area, particularly that adjacent to Albuquerque.

Also located along the valley floor is the main line of the A. T. & S. F. Railway and the G. C. & S. F. Railway. The Santa Fe Railroad handled over 20 percent of all the cross-country transportation during World War II and undoubtedly would occupy an important position in the national defense during any emergency which might face the United States. Unless and until various features of the comprehensive plan of development for the Middle Rio Grande Valley, which has been authorized by the Congress, has been completed, all of the above cities, industries, and defense installations are very vulnerable to damage from high water which reliable records indicate can be regularly expected along the Rio Grande.

The comprehensive plan was approved and the project authorized by the Congress in two separate legislative acts. One in 1948 and the second in 1950. These authorizations provided for various improvements to the irrigation system and particularly for the channelization of the Rio Grande, rehabilitation of the levee system and construction of various sediment and flood control structures on tributaries of the river within the State of New Mexico. One important feature, a dam on the Jemez River, has been completed and I am sure will provide some help for our problem. However, the maximum flood control contemplated under the authorizations cannot be provided until all features are completed. This would apply particularly to the rehabilitation of the levee system and construction of the Abiquiu Dam. There has been some channelization work done, particularly in those areas where it would be of the greatest benefit to the water salvage program which is being carried on under appropriations made to the Bureau of Reclamation. This channelization construction is definitely subject to damage during periods of excessive runoff which occurs at intervals on the Rio Grande. In view of this situation, we believe that it would be much wiser to concentrate on the construction of upstream control rather than an extension of this channelization program into areas where there is no water salvage problem.

The legislation now under consideration provided for an item of approximately $1,600,000 to carry on the rebuilding of the levee system to protect the city of Albuquerque from floodwaters of the Rio Grande. This is most desirable and urgent, however, I am sure you understand this levee system has to be designed under a program that would contemplate the completion of all features of the comprehensive plan. We have contributed a considerable amount of funds to the construction of this levee system and do not doubt that this committee will approve the proposed appropriation to continue this work. This levee will provide certain flood control relief, however, I am sure it is evident to this committee that until the other structures, particularly Abiquiu Dam, are completed that the middle Rio Grande is in a very hazardous position. Since the Congress has authorized the construction of this structure, we believe that an appropriation to start construction on the Abiquiu Dam is entirely in order and are sure that it has been given every economic and physical justification by the Army engineers. We have been assured that plans and specifications have now been completed to a point where construction can be commenced and a minimum of $500,000 could be economically spent during the 1956 fiscal year on foundation and outlet sections.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which now operates and maintains the irrigation, drainage, and flood-control structures of the Rio Grande by a contract with the

Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, is faced with a terrific sediment problem which the construction of Aliquiu Dam would greatly alleviate. A resolution in the amount of sediment load in the river, in our area, would decrease operation and maintenance expenses several hundred thousand dollars a year and would increase the repayment ability for construction costs, by the local people, by a substantial margin.

I believe that some of the members of this committee have made visits in our area and are personally acquainted with our problem and we wish to extend an invitation to other members to visit our area at any time they might find possible. We believe that the appropriation to carry on the above requests are imperative for all the reasons set out and would like to have an opportunity to show you first hand how important this entire project is to the State of New Mexico and the Nation, and particularly the national defense.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, gentlemen. I will say that your representatives have been most diligent.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

OREGON PROJECTS

WITNESSES

HON. EDITH GREEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON
HON. WAYNE MORSE, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OREGON
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be pleased to hear this afternoon Congresswoman Green, of Oregon, and Senator Morse, of Oregon. I understand Senator Neuberger has indicated a desire to be present but he is tied up at the moment. Is that correct, Senator Morse?

Senator MORSE. He expects to be down very shortly.

Mr. EVINS. We are very fond of our new colleague from Oregon, Mrs. Green; she is very gracious and very diligent and we certainly are pleased to have her as we are the Senators from Oregon.

You may proceed, Mrs. Green.

Mrs. GREEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your committee.

Development of the economy of the Northwest is unalterably involved in and in great measure parallels the development of public works in the area. It is apparent that budget recommendations proposed by the administration for these purposes during the fiscal year 1956 are grossly inadequate and therefore disastrously constrictive to economic expansion of the area.

My colleagues, Senators Morse and Neuberger, and I, are of course greatly concerned with all of these projects. Rather than utilize the committee's time unnecessarily, I ask consent to file with the committee a more detailed presentation and at this time, to emphasize my concern over several of these projects which have special importance to the people of Oregon's Third District.

This is an authorized project which involves dredging of a half-mile channel, 48 feet in depth, at a cost of $2,898,000. Also envisioned for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

construction, when deemed feasible, is a $5,657,000 jetty at the river's mouth. At its present 40-foot depth, the channel offers danger, discouragement and considerable economic loss to shippers and operators. In many cases, loading of cargo destined for Columbia River ports must now be limited to subcapacity amounts. In others, costly delays are experienced as weather conditions preclude safe passage.

In House Document 249, 83d Congress, the Army engineers estimated total benefits resulting from the proposed improvement by elimination of delays due to storms, cargo shutouts and ship groundings, amount to 382,800 annually. Over 50-year average, the engineers estimate conservatively a ratio of benefits to costs of 1.68 to 1.

It is obvious that many benefits to the area drained by the Columbia are derived from a prosperous shipping industry and improvements in navigation. Total ocean commerce for Portland and other Columbia River ports has averaged 9,100,000 tons annually during the past 5 years. More than 5,000 longshoremen work in the lower Columbia River area in an average year, totaling wages of $11,735,000. There are many other benefits which time does not permit listing. However, all benefits diminish as the project to deepen the channel is held up, and the future expansion of the area's industries, domestic and world trade is delayed.

It can be seen readily that deepening of the channel to 48 feet is imperative for future economic development, and it is conceivable that the project could be of great importance to the national defense. However, the President's budget recommendations do not include this vital project. I join with my colleagues in asserting that a minimum of $1 million should be appropriated for this purpose. Such an amount would permit the early start of this vital project and would carry on work for at least 1 year to the extent that important progress will be accomplished. Once completed, it will negate the existing dangers and costly delays now experienced in entering the river. Because of unsuitable weather conditions, it is conceivable that the full amount of appropriations which my colleagues and I are recommending for this project, may not be utilized during the fiscal year. However, it is probable that the recommended $1 million will be needed and the tremendous importance of the project impels me to strongly urge the committee's favorable consideration of this amount.

Among the other projects, the Johnson Creek project is of particular concern to my district, also. It is noteworthy that completion of planning on the first part of this project and the instituting of construction can be accomplished with the appropriation of $35,000. Johnson Creek is Multnomah County's only tributary to the Willamette. It constitutes a serious drainage problem to portions of the county. Commencement of work on the $519,000 project will be of inestimable value to the area, and I ask the committtee's favorable consideration of the proposed $35,000 appropriation.

There is an urgency about these and several other projects which I would like to convey to the committee. Construction should begin early in the fiscal year on Hills Creek and Ice Harbor. The Hills Creek project is 95 percent ready for construction—the only project in the Willamette River Basin in that status. The appropriation of $2,009,050 which my colleagues and I have proposed will complete planning and get construction underway.

The major multipurpose Ice Harbor dam project is in a similar status; it is the only such project in the Columbia River Basin ready for construction. To complete planning and to begin this project it is proposed that the committee appropriate $3,500,000. The President has recommended no appropriations for this project, but may I emphasize, that the project is needed—desperately; it is ready to be built. The amount my colleagues and I have recommended will get it started.

Here again, are instances of prevailing urgency. Preconstruction planning funds are vital if starts on construction are to be made in the near future. In the case of John Day Dam, only $500,000 has been recommended by the administration for planning, although it is estimated by the engineers that $750,000 to $1,500,000 would be required during the fiscal year. Accordingly, I recommend that the greater amount be appropriated to speed the planning phase.

The President's budget recommendation for Cougar Dam again, is another case of inadequacy. Insufficient funds are recommended by him. It is estimated that $250,000 will complete planning, and I recommend this amount be appropriated along with $250,000 which will permit commencement of construction later in the fiscal year. I should like to add that flood losses along the Willamette River Basin amount to millions of dollars each year. Cougar Dam, to be located on a major tributary of the Willamette, the South Fork of the McKenzie River, has been authorized as a flood-control project. Addition of Federal power facilities were authorized in the last Congress in the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors Act. Power facilities of Cougar are scheduled to provide between 25,000 and 35,000 kilowatts capacity. The need for the Cougar Dam project is very great, and in view of the expected 5-year construction period it will require, it is imperative that planning be completed and work started as soon as possible. The appropriation recommended herewith may be considered a minimum but sound appropriation for that purpose.

The committee will note that no funds are included in the administration recommendation for the Green Peter-White Ridge project which has been authorized both as a flood control and a Federal power project. Located on the South Santiam River, a Willamette tributary, Green Peter-White Ridge is scheduled to provide a capacity of 81,000 kilowatts. Planning will require 2 years. It is apparent that if construction—which will take about 4 years—is to begin as soon as possible, adequate funds must be provided now. The amount suggested—$200,000—is needed during the fiscal year according to the Army engineers, and I recommend that amount to the committee.

As the detailed recommendations attached to my statement will show, there are other projects in the Northwest deserving of the committee's consideration.

In closing, may I again emphasize the important relationship between an orderly progress in public works development in the Northwest to the economy growth of the region. Disregard for this relationship, as would be evidenced in unsuitable appropriations for project surveys, planning and construction, could have disastrous consequences.

I want to express my appreciation for the committee's kindness in allowing time for these statements.

(The detailed presentation follows:)

RECAPITULATION OF APPROPRIATION

Recommendations of Senator Morse, Senator Neuberger, and Congresswoman Green for fiscal year July 1, 1955–June 30, 1956

A. CONSTRUCTION

Project	Project cost	Benefits	Status	Amount in President's budget	Amount usable fiscal 1956	Amount recommended by Senators Morse, Neuberger, and Representative Green	Additional recommended by Senators Morse, Neuberger, and Representative Green
Hills Creek Dam	$32,065,000	Flood control and 20,000 kilowatts installed capacity plus downstream benefits to Lookout Point-Dexter Dams.	Authorized; planning 95 percent completed.	[1] $10,000	$2,009,050	[2] $2,009,050	$1,199,050
Cougar Dam	$37,500,000	Flood control and 25,000-35,000 kilowatt installed capacity.	Authorized; some planning accomplished.	[1] 100,000	500,000	[3] 500,000	400,000
Ice Harbor Dam	110,000,000	Navigation aid and 139,000 kilowatts initial installed capacity; 204,000 kilowatts total installed capacity.	Authorized; ready for construction.	None	3,500,000	[4] 3,500,000	3,500,000
Willamette River bank protection	11,000,000	Flood control	$5.7 million already appropriated.	300,000	[5] 300,000–800,000	[5] 300,000–800,000	[5] 300,000–800,000
The Dalles Dam	300,000,000	Flood control, navigation and 1,092,000 kilowatts initial installed capacity.	Under construction	63,500,000	63,500,000	63,500,000	
McNary Dam	287,300,000	Flood control, navigation and power.	Under construction (almost completed).	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	
Lookout Point Dam and Reservoir	89,600,000	Flood control and 120,000 kilowatts installed capacity.	Under construction; close to completion.	200,000	200,000	200,000	
Lower Columbia fish sanctuary program		Preservation of fish runs		1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	
Columbia River at the mouth	8,555,000	Navigation	Authorized	None	700,000–1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.	3,589,000	Navigation; deepen channel to 27-foot depth for oceangoing vessels.	Authorized	None	[6]	[7]	
Tillamook Bay and Bar	[8] 1,750,000	Navigation and fishery protection.	Authorized; ready for construction.	None	250,000	250,000	250,000
Coos Bay (Charleston Harbor and Channel).	696,000	Navigation	Authorized; planning almost completed.	None	236,000	[9] 236,000	236,000
Subtotals				76,510,000	84,395,050	84,395,050	7,385,050

See footnotes at end of tables.

RECAPITULATION OF APPROPRIATION—Continued

Recommendations of Senator Morse, Senator Neuberger, and Congresswoman Green for fiscal year July 1, 1955–June 30, 1956—Continued

B. ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN (PLANNING)

Project	Project cost	Benefits	Status	Amount in President's budget	Amount usable fiscal 1956	Amount recommended by Senators Morse, Neuberger, and Representative Green	Additional recommended by Senators Morse, Neuberger, and Representative Green
John Day Dam	$312,000,000-400,000,000	Flood control, navigation, and 1,100,000 kilowatts initial installed capacity; 1,500,000 kilowatts total capacity.	Authorized (no planning)	$500,000	[10] $750,000 1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,000,000
Green Peter (White Bridge reregulating dam).	62,000,000	Flood control and 81,000 kilowatts of installed capacity.	do	None	[11] 200,000	200,000	200,000
Couger Dam [12]			Authorized	100,000	[12] 250,000	[12] 250,000	[12] 150,000
Hills Creek Dam [12]			Authorized (planning 95 percent complete).	[13] 10,000	[13] 10,000	[13] 10,000	
Amazon Creek	[14] 894,000	Flood control	Authorized and modified (substantial planning accomplished).	22,000	22,000	22,000	
Columbia River local protection:							
Grande Ronde River		Flood control	Authorized	55,000	55,000	55,000	
Malheur River				6,000	6,000	6,000	
Prineville River				4,000	4,000	4,000	
Johnson Creek	519,000	Flood control	Authorized (planning almost complete).	35,000	35,000	35,000	
Lower Columbia River improvements to existing works (Multnomah D. D.).		Navigation	Within authorization	35,000	35,000	35,000	
Subtotal				767,000	2,117,000	2,117,000	1,350,000

C. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.				$100,000		$100,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oreg. and Wash.				230,000		230,000	
Columbia and lower Willamette below Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash.				1,600,000		1,600,000	
Coos Bay				620,000		620,000	
Coquille River				130,000		130,000	
Umpqua River				160,000		160,000	
				390,000		390,000	

				620,000		620,000	
Coquille River				130,000		130,000	
Umpqua River				160,000		160,000	
Willamette River above Portland and Yamhill River.				390,000		390,000	
Yaquina Bay and Harbor				810,000		810,000	
The Dalles-Celilo Canal, Oreg. and Wash.				100,000		100,000	
Willamette River at Willamette Falls				160,000		160,000	
Cottage Grove Reservoir, Oreg				31,000		31,000	
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg				30,000		30,000	
Fern Ridge Reservoir, Oreg				74,000		74,000	
Willamette River bank protection				50,000		50,000	
Bonneville Dam				1,800,000		1,800,000	
Detroit Reservoir				309,000		309,000	
Lookout Point Reservoir				320,000		320,000	
McNary Dam, Oreg. and Wash				1,053,000		1,053,000	
Subtotal				7,967,000		7,967,000	
D. EXAMINATIONS AND SURVEYS							
Oregon Slough				$1,000		$1,000	
Dry Hollow				8,500		8,500	
Silvies River and tributaries				15,000		15,000	
Miscellaneous projects in Columbia and Willamette River Basins.[15]				None		400,000	
Subtotal				24,500		424,500	
E. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION CONSTRUCTION							
Talent irrigation	$20,560,855	Irrigation, flood control and power.	Authorized	None	$2,500,000	$2,500,000	$2,500,000
Total				$85,088,500	97,403,550	97,403,550	

[1] For planning only.
[2] For completion of planning and start of construction.
[3] $250,000 for completion of planning; $250,000 for start of construction.
[4] $100,000 to complete planning; remainder for construction.
[5] Final figures not yet provided by Army Engineers.
[6] Figures not available.
[7] Figures not available; recommend start.
[8] $250,000 contributed by local groups.
[9] $36,000 of which is for planning.
[10] See detailed testimony; excess of planning funds to be used for advance engineering and design of other projects; no such funds have been requested in the budget.
[11] For almost 50 percent of planning.
[12] Already included in total for construction. (See sec. A.)
[13] Already included in total for construction. (See sec. A.)
[14] As modified.
[15] E. g., Crooked River, South Yamhill, Umpqua River, Nehalem Bay, Port Orford, Tillamook Bay; there are some 23 authorized surveys for which no funds have been recommended by the President.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Congressman Green.

The committee will hear next Senator Morse, and then have our questions together.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like permission to have my full statement, including a summary chart, inserted in the record in order to conserve the committee's time, and I shall just limit my remarks to highlighting what is contained in the statement.

Mr. EVINS. They may be incorporated in the record, Senator Morse.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear and testify on the vital and pressing needs for public works starts in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. Unfortunately, the present administration has made not 1 recommendation for a major project start in Oregon or the Pacific Northwest for any of the 3 fiscal years for which it has made budget recommendations.

IMMEDIATE NEED FOR NEW PROJECT STARTS IN OREGON

At the very time when power shortages have been imminent and future chronic power shortages obvious, it is all that we in Congress have been able to do to keep projects started in former years on schedule.

In fact, I was advised this morning that the Atomic Energy Committee prophesies that by the year 2000, the economy of our country will be such that we will need power at a rate 20 times the amount of power now available in the United States, which gives you some idea of the great future of our economy and the regulation of power to that extent.

The situation has been permitted by the administration to become so bad that only two of the multipurpose projects already authorized have been brought to the point where construction could be begun if funds are provided. As my detailed testimony will show, the urgent need now is to start construction of the Hills Creek and Ice Harbor projects and to press forward with the completion of planning for the John Day, Cougar, and Green Peter power and flood control projects.

Now may I say, Mr. Chairman, that it does not make one whit of difference what program is adopted for the construction of these projects in the final stages, the planning is going to be the same. The Army engineers point out that the same money is going to be needed for planning whether it is done by Government construction or by partnership construction, and I think it is a great mistake for it to be sidetracked over a political fight of partnership as to time, when all we need is to go ahead with the planning money. The planning of these dams is going to be the same, no matter who builds the dam because they involve flood-control features and the Army engineers, of course, under either proposal, will be the organization that will do the planning and the construction.

It is imperative that this preconstruction planning be prosecuted as vigorously as possible so that actual construction starts could be made in the years immediately ahead. Unless there is maximum activity on preconstruction planning, no new start could be undertaken in the Pacific Northwest for several years under any circumstances and under any scheme of financing, except Ice Harbor Dam and the Hills Creek project.

JOHN DAY DAM—PLANNING FUNDS

The John Day Dam which was authorized several years ago would be primarily a power project located on the main stem of the Columbia near the mouth of John Day River. It will have an installed capacity of 1,100,000 kilowatts which, with the addition of upstream storage, can be increased to 1,500,000 kilowatts.

The President recommended only $500,000 for preconstruction planning on John Day for fiscal year 1956, although the Senators from Oregon, Washington, and Montana urged that he recommend $1.5 million before the budget was submitted to Congress.

John Day planning will take almost 2 full years to complete, according to data submitted to me by the Corps of Engineers. If the Pacific Northwest is to have a fighting chance to avoid predicted critical power shortages in the years ahead, it is imperative that this great power project be readied for construction at the earliest possible date.

The amount of $500,000 recommended by the President is inadequate for this purpose. In July 1954, the Portland district engineer of the corps advised me as follows; and I quote from his letter:

> Normal and accelerated schedules: A period of 2 years would be required for planning this project on a normal schedule prior to initiation of construction. Under an accelerated schedule, assuming planning funds are made available by about August 15 so that foundation exploration and other fieldwork could start immediately following the annual flood season, construction could probably be started 16 to 18 months after start of planning.
>
> Preconstruction fund requirements: Under a normal planning schedule, appropriation of about $2 million would be required to prepare the project for construction. Of that amount about $700,000 would be required the first year. Under an accelerated schedule, funds requirements would be about $2,500,000 of which $1,500,000 would be required the first year.

It was on the basis of that letter of the Army engineers that I introduced with my colleagues the proposal for the planning fund of $1,500,000.

The Corps of Engineers in Washington has recently advised my office that $700,000 to $750,000 could be used in fiscal year 1956 for planning. If such an amount rather than $500,000 were appropriated this year, a construction start could be made in fiscal 1957. My colleagues, Senator Neuberger and Congresswoman Green, join in urging a minimum appropriation of $750,000 for the coming fiscal year. The Senators from Washington and Montana join with us.

The committee will recall that last year we got that amount through the Senate, but it was dropped out in conference. We also feel that it might be advisable to appropriate $1.5 million on the chance that an accelerated planning schedule of 16 to 18 months for planning might be possible. The Corps of Engineers has recently advised my office that the 1954 estimate that this would be possible is somewhat doubtful.

However, the larger sum might prove usable in bringing closer the date when construction of the John Day Dam could be begun. Its power potential is so urgently required that the possibility of accelerated planning should not be discarded without exhaustive consideration.

The John Day project has the support of the people of the Pacific Northwest who recognize the urgent need for the power it will provide

and the flood-control and navigation benefits it will contribute to the region.

Resolutions in support of substantial planning funds for the John Day Dam have been submitted to me by: Oregon State Grangers, Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Common Council of the City of Umatilla, the Inland Empire Waterways Association, Westland Grange of Umatilla County, the Improved Order of Red Men and the Degree of Pocahontas, and the North Gilliam County Chamber of Commerce, among others.

COUGAR DAM—PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION FUND

Cougar is in my backyard, in my hometown, and I have had long association with the problems of the Eugene Water Board over the years, concerning their municipal plant, and I want to see the dam constructed, I want to see it constructed as fast as it possibly can be done, as a Federal project, as is presently authorized. And as my colleague has made clear, it is very important for the future immediately ahead.

Cougar Dam is a vitally needed multipurpose project near Eugene, Oreg. Its primary value is for flood control, providing 210,000 acre-feet of storage, of which 155,000 would be usable for other than power purposes.

Flood problems are acute in the Willamette River Basin which drains the most heavily populated area of Oregon. The Cougar site is on the South Fork of the McKenzie River, a principal tributary of the Willamette River.

Flood losses in the basin are estimated at millions of dollars annually, primarily in erosion of valuable and irreplaceable farmland.

Cougar is part of an alternative to the Quartz Creek flood-control project originally authorized in 1938. Cougar itself was authorized as a flood-control project only. In the last Congress the addition of Federal power facilities was authorized in the omnibus rivers and harbors act. The power facilities of Cougar would provide between 25,000 and 35,000 kilowatts of capacity, depending upon whether it is used as a firm power or peaking plant.

The President's budget recommends only $100,000 for Cougar planning. That is only two-fifths of what is required and usable for planning in the coming fiscal year and only one-fifth of what can be used on a normal schedule for planning and construction in fiscal year 1956.

And I would like to state what the Army engineers have pointed out to me, that there is greater efficiency and economy in the expenditure of the tax dollar if you have a sufficient amount of money for planning in a given year as against having an inadequate amount and then have to let it go over into another year.

Therefore, I urge an appropriation of $250,000 for completion of project planning and an additional $250,000 for construction which could thereby be begun toward the end of fiscal 1956— that is, by next spring.

Oddly enough the President said he would recommend $1 million for fiscal 1956 if Cougar is authorized as a so-called partnership project. However, that amount of money cannot be used in the next year.

This data has been provided to me by the Corps of Engineers which is emphatic that an accelerated program is not possible on Cougar.

The total project cost is estimated at $37.5 million and it is expected that it would take 5 years to construct. If full planning funds are provided, the total project can be accomplished in 6 years.

Oregon and the Pacific Northwest need the flood control and power that Cougar would provide; $500,000 for planning and construction for the coming fiscal year would be a sound and the minimum investment for those purposes.

GREEN PETER-WHITE BRIDGE PROJECT-PLANNING FUNDS

Green Peter is also a key flood control project for the Willamette River Basin. Its history parallels that of Cougar. It is a substitute for an earlier flood control project and was authorized several years ago for flood control only.

In 1954, Federal power facilities were authorized to be added to the Green Peter and White Bridge project (the latter a small reregulating dam newly authorized).

It would provide about 300,000 acre-feet of storage on the South Santiam River (near Sweet Home, Oreg.) another major tributary of the Willamette.

Installed power capacity of 81,000 kilowatts is projected for Green Peter-White Bridge. This important flood control and power project has an estimated total cost of $62 million.

It will take a minimum of 2 years of planning to ready Green Peter for construction, the Army engineers tell us, and construction will take about 4 years. If this project is to be built in the reasonably near future, it is obvious that preconstruction planning must be undertaken this coming fiscal year.

Unfortunately, the President recommends no funds for this purpose.

Maximum progress on planning can be achieved in fiscal year 1956 by an appropriation of $200,000 which would provide for completion of almost 50 percent of the necessary preconstruction planning. The engineers inform me it would be impossible to accelerate planning because no planning and design has been accomplished to date. Total planning fund requirements are $700,000 to $800,000.

Both Cougar and Green Peter-White Bridge are integral parts of the engineers main control plan for the Willamette River Basin and are urgently required and desired in the basin.

Substantial progress can be made on Cougar and Green Peter-White Bridge for comparatively small expenditures. The Administration's budget requests are totally inadequate for them. The Administration's position that $3 million would be recommended for them if they are authorized as partnership projects is unrealistic. That amount cannot be used in the next fiscal year, the Corps of Engineers informs me.

The Willamette iver Basin Commission of Oregon strongly recommends maximum planning funds for the Cougar and Green Peter-White Bridge projects. The commission is supported in its recommendations by numerous local groups representing farmers, business and labor, including:

Yamhill County Project Committee
Lane Pomona Grange

Santa Clara Grange No. 746
Waterville Grange No. 416
Willakenzie Grange No. 498
Coburg West Point Grange No. 535
Linn County Farm Bureau
Lane County Project Committee
Polk County Project Committee
Benton County Project Committee

In addition the following have submitted resolutions to me stressing the importance of early construction:

Albany Chamber of Commerce
Lebanon Chamber of Commerce
Salem Chamber of Commerce
Sweet Home Chamber of Commerce
Local 659, IBEW, Albany
Linn County Farmers Union
Local 5-251, IWA, CIO
Albany Central Labor Council
Sidney-Talbott Farmers Union
Linn County Court
Marion County Court
Local 2554-A, Plywood & Veneer Workers
Albany Kiwanis Club
Lebanon Kiwanis Club
Sweet Home Kiwanis Club
North Lebanon Water Control District
Sweet Home Rotary Club
Sweet Home Jr. Chamber of Commerce
Linn County Farm Bureau
Lebanon Lions Club
Local 2791, Lumber and Sawmill Workers

HILLS CREEK—CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

This is the only new flood control-power project in the Willamette River Basin ready for construction in the fiscal year starting July 1, 1955.

Five hundred eighty-seven thousand five hundred dollars have been allocated for planning, which is 95 percent complete. Its construction can be begun immediately.

It has a lower total cost and greater annual benefits than Cougar and Green Peter. (See "Water Resources Development by the Corps of Engineers in Oregon—office of the division engineer, Portland, Oreg.—January 1, 1953, pp. 35-39.)

It will prevent annual flood damage of $1,637,200 with its 280,000 acre-feet of storage (as compared with 210,000 acre-feet of Cougar and 368,500 for Green Peter-White Bridge).

It will have an installed capacity of 20,000 kilowatts. In addition, it will increase the power output of Lookout Point Dam, which has an installed capacity of 120,000 kilowatts that cannot be fully used today, although the project is in operation. The 1953 Portland division engineers' report states: "This project is closely related to Lookout Point Reservoir downstream from Hills Creek. The integration of the two

projects involves the transfer of flood control storage from Lookout Point Reservoir to Hills Creek Reservoir in the interest of maximum power production at Lookout Point."

Construction can be begun with an appropriation of $2,000,050 and completed in 4 years—about a year before Cougar and 2 years before Green Peter if each is carried forward with maximum speed.

In view of the urgent need for flood control and power in the region, Hills Creek is the obvious and only possible new start. If construction of Hills Creek is begun and maximum planning funds provided for Cougar and Green Peter, Oregon will be making real progress toward meeting the urgent flood control needs of the area and increasing electric power supplies.

The Willamette River Basin Commission and local groups are strong in their support for this vital and economical project.

ICE HARBOR DAM—CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

This is the only major multipurpose project in the Columbia River Basin that is ready for construction. In years past I have joined with the Senators from Washington in urging that its construction be begun.

Although it is the only possible new start and has been for several years, the present administration has not recommended any funds for its construction.

Ice Harbor, 1 of the 4 major dams authorized for the Long Snake River, would have an initial installed capacity of 139,000 kilowatts. With upstream storage, its installed capacity will total 204,000 kilowatts. In addition, it would provide substantial navigation benefits.

Not only are the power and navigation benefits of Ice Harbor needed for themselves. We must continue with multipurpose dam construction on an orderly basis or we will lose the capacity to undertake such construction.

I ask consent to introduce into the record a letter, dated March 5, 1955, from Mr. George Atkinson, president of the Willamette Iron & Steel Co.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

WILLAMETTE IRON & STEEL CO.,
Portland, Oreg., March 5, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Knowing of your long-standing position in favor of development of the Northwest, we wish to call your urgent attention to the serious and widespread misunderstanding of the present "construction boom." Although this so-called boom is real as far as total construction is concerned, the fact is that major heavy construction is decreasing to a fraction of its former volume, and as manufacturers of special equipment for this type of project, we are vitally interested.

A recent survey covering the major civil-works projects of the Corps of Engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation (projects which involved construction contracts of approximately $5 million or more in size) showed that over the last 5 years the number of such projects being started annually by these agencies has decreased at least 75 percent, and that the number of major contracts required for these projects has decreased more than 90 percent.

We enclose a graph which shows the alarming decrease in new contracts awarded for major civil-works construction as contrasted with the rapidly in-

creasing rate of construction as a whole. In addition, this graph shows the steadily falling rate of total expenditures for conservation and development projects. With respect to the latter it is to be noted that most of the present remaining volume of 1955 heavy construction consists of work on large projects commenced several years ago.

The fact is that while previously commenced projects are rapidly being completed, the commencement of new major projects has been almost entirely eliminated. It is true that a number of smaller jobs have been started, but these simply will not fill the void created by the elimination of the heavier projects, neither the proposed new highway programs nor continued high-level building acivity alleviate this situation. They will, of course, help business generally and will provide more than ample work for the contractors and suppliers who specialize in these fields, but they will not help those industries whose livelihood depends on heavier types of construction.

It is becoming more evident every day that not enough new large projects are being commenced to keep the heavy construction pipeline full nor, in fact, to maintain even the present volume of such work. No serious repercussions have occurred so far because of the activity on old projects; but the time is fast approaching when the full effects of the decline in heavy construction starts will be felt.

One belief widely held is that major heavy public works construction is a depression palliative which can be quickly started to relieve economic stress and unemployment, but this idea is entirely erroneous and misleading as was recently brought out before the Joint Congressional Committee on the President's Economic Report. There is a long period of investigation, planning, manufacturing and equipping which must precede actual construction on every large project and which cannot be accelerated hurriedly.

We believe that another difficulty is that many Government officials, properly desiring to hold total public works appropriations to a minimum and being misled by the boom publicity, have either not recognized that heavy civil works construction will soon come to a complete standstill or do not appreciate the seriousness of the effect that will result. They have evidently not realized that the heavy work pipeline must be kept full by starting new major projects regularly in order to avoid serious unbalance in the construction industry and its damaging effect on employment and the economy generally.

The most recent evidence of this is in the Federal budget for 1956, which provides funds for the commencement by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of only four [1] new major authorized heavy construction projects, the largest of which is small when compared to many projects now under construction. This will mean, at best, only 20 to 25 percent of the past few years volume of this type of work.

This entire problem is very serious, not only to those directly concerned, but also in its effect on many other industries. The construction of a major project not only stabilizes employment and business in its immediate locality for several years—but it also gives major support to the heavy machinery, the heavy truck manufacturing, the equipment, steel, cement, sand and gravel, transportation, and other similar industries for the several-year period involved.

The key to this situation is the commencement of major projects. Contracts are still being let on some projects which were started as long ago as 1947—Garrison Dam, for example; but the point is that no new Garrison's, or Oahe's, or McNary's are now in the final planning stage—so that the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 will be virtually dormant in heavy construction even if new projects are commenced as soon as possible.

We wish to make it clear that this letter is not intended as an argument for construction for its own sake. Obviously, each project constructed must be fully justified, both economically and generally. It is simply an effort to bring to your notice the necessity for maintaining a reasonable uniform program of major project starts geared to our national growth and needs and commensurate with the levels of economic activity in other fields.

In the interest of brevity we have held this letter to the shortest possible statement that would serve to point out the seriousness of this situation. How-

[1] 1. Old River project, Louisiana (Corps of Engineers). 2. Eagle Gorge Reservoir, Wash. (Corps of Engineers). 3. Palo Verde project, Arizona-California-Nevada (Bureau of Reclamation). 4. Santa Maria project, California (Bureau of Reclamation).

ever, if you should desire further information, we will be glad to assemble and submit additional background and other supplemental data.

We strongly urge you to initiate and actively support a program which will restore a healthy level of activity in the field of major heavy civil works because of the far-reaching benefits to be achieved.

Very truly yours,

GEO. H. ATKINSON, *President.*

A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING AND ADVISORY BOARDS OF THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA, ST. LOUIS, MO., SEPTEMBER 27–29, 1954

MAJOR HEAVY PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

The governing and advisory boards of the Associated General Contractors of America, meeting in St. Louis, September 27–29, recommends that Congress carefully consider these facts:

1. A serious misconception exists as to the nature of the present construction boom so that, while the grand total for all construction remains high, the volume of Government expenditures for heavy civil works continue to decrease. These Federal projects constitute the main volume of heavy public works;

2. This decline is so precipitous as to be alarming—Federal heavy works awards for the first 7 months of 1954 being approximately 30 percent under those for the same period in 1953;

3. Furthermore, most of the current major awards represent contracts for the final sections of previously started large projects; and virtually no "new starts" of major projects are being made—in fact, recent dispatches indicate that the present policy is to entirely curtail new starts on Federal civil-works projects;

4. The nature of heavy construction is such that it cannot be turned off in time of boom or quickly started anew in time of recession, but in order to do so must maintain at all times a minimum volume of active major projects so that skeleton construction organizations may be held together;

5. Because of the specialized type of plant, management organizations, and skills required for heavy construction work, this segment of the industry cannot be readily converted to lighter kinds of work; nor can organizations once disbanded be quickly reestablished;

6. Unless a sufficient number of new starts of major projects are made in 1955 and each of the following years, the volume of heavy work will fall entirely below the level necessary for the preservation of this segment of the industry. Such a disruption would so cripple heavy construction that it would be unable to rapidly accelerate in time of recession or to adequately meet the demands of any national emergency.

7. Mining, manufacturing, transportation, supply, and many other industries all have a large stake in heavy construction; and Federal expenditures in this field not only result in widespread employment but also undergird the whole economy.

We urgently request that Congress make adequate appropriations so that a sufficient number of new starts on major public works projects designed to develop our natural resources will be made in each succeeding year.

The alarming and valid argument that he makes and documents is that if we do not continue to keep the major heavy construction pipeline full, the Nation will be rendered unable to undertake such construction if an emergency need arises. To use another analogy, if we permit our heavy-construction muscles to atrophy from disuse, we will not be able to revive them rapidly enough to meet future needs.

As he points out, the major multipurpose dams now under construction will be completed soon, for example, McNary, The Dalles, and Chief Joseph.

Unless Ice Harbor and John Day and Hells Canyon construction is begun in the years immediately ahead, the Nation's heavy-construction industry and the industries which serve it will contract and lose their ability to produce as needed.

These conclusions and supporting data are presented by a recommendation to the Congress adopted by the boards of the Associated General Contractors of America in September 1954. I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the record at this point in my remarks.

COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL—VANCOUVER TO THE DALLES—CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

Congress can transform into reality the possibility of deep-draft navigation from the commerce lanes of the Pacific Ocean up the Columbia River to The Dalles, the natural gateway to the Inland Empire. This would provide one of the few places in the world where ocean commerce can go through a major mountain range into an inland area.

This was suggested by President Roosevelt at the Bonneville project in August 1934, when he said: "I hope it will be found the part of wisdom to install ship locks in this dam at this time, so that navigation may be extended to the interior."

A great step forward was taken when locks providing for depths of 26 and 32 feet over the sills were constructed in Bonneville Dam instead of the 9 feet, as originally planned. On August 26, 1937, Congress authorized a ship channel from Vancouver, Wash., to Bonneville Dam of a depth of 27 feet and a bottom width of 300 feet. This action was reaffirmed and increased by the Congress in the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 24, 1946, which extended this channel authorization to The Dalles, Oreg.

This great development of a channel for oceangoing vessels would have been accomplished but for the interruption of two wars. The channel, as far as Bonneville Dam, was almost completed when World War II struck and caused a cessation of work, which delayed its completion until 1949. The channel between Bonneville Dam and The Dalles would have been finished shortly after 1949, in accordance with the plans of the Army engineers, had not the outbreak of hostilities in Korea caused all such work to be stopped.

All that stands now between that historic vision of President Roosevelt and its fulfillment are a few channel alinement corrections in the 3 or 4 miles above Bonneville Dam. I submit that the time has come to translate it into reality and thereby aid the growth of a great new economic area—the Inland Empire.

A request has been made to the engineers for detailed data of cost and the amount that would be required to get this project under way. That information was not available when this testimony was prepared. It undoubtedly will be available to the committee before it marks up the bill, and I urge that funds will be provided for a start on this project. The longer it is delayed, the more expensive it will be.

This project will open up an entire new region to oceanborne commerce, just as we are presently opening up mid-continent America by means of the St. Lawrence seaway. It is a project which will have a benefit-cost ratio of unimaginable proportions, a project which will bring untold benefits to a million people and to an area of 200,000 square miles. I urge the inclusion of this project in the appropriations for the next fiscal year, and thus justify the faith and vision of the planners who fought for and succeeded in obtaining the deep-draft locks in Bonneville Dam.

I should like to submit for the record a statement concerning this problem which was prepared by one of those selfsame planners, Mr. W. S. Nelson, who is manager of the chamber of commerce of The Dallas, Oreg. Mr. Nelson is one of those public servants who do their work largely unrecognized, but without whom history would be completely different.

For well over 30 years W. S. Nelson has served the mid-Columbia area with a total devotion and allegiance we could all well emulate. To him must go the greater share of the credit for the new interstate bridge at The Dalles, and without his vision and diligent efforts it is doubtful that The Dalles Dam would today be under construction. No single worthy development in the progress and growth of the mid-Columbia area in a third of a century has failed to profit from his wisdom and gain strength from his efforts toward coordinating, integrating, and expanding the economy of that area.

(Mr. Nelson's statement follows:)

STATEMENT CONCERNING INSTALLATION OF SHIP LOCK IN BONNEVILLE DAM CONSTRUCTION OF SHIP CHANNEL—VANCOUVER, WASH., TO BONNEVILLE DAM RECTIFICATION OF SHIP CHANNEL ALINEMENT—BONNEVILLE DAM TO THE DALLES, PREPARED BY W. S. NELSON BY REQUEST OF PORT OF THE DALLES COMMISSION, THE DALLES, OREG., MARCH 26, 1955

THE ISSUE

The ship channel between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg., cannot be completed and made usable unless and until an appropriation can be obtained for channel alinement rectification of that portion of it that extends from Bonneville Dam to The Dalles, which was fully authorized in the Rivers and Harbors Act of July 24, 1946.

Channel alinement improvement, recommended by the Army engineers, is principally in the Eagle Creek and Cascade Rapids area, both of which are in close proximity of Bonneville Dam. This improvement could and should have been made while Bonneville Dam was under construction, as shown elsewhere in this statement.

EXISTING SITUATION

Bonneville Dam—its location and construction

In the first comprehensive plan for the development of the Columbia River, from the head of the tidal section to the Canadian boundary, as presented to Congress, March 29, 1932, by the Corps of Engineers and reported in House Document 103, 73d Congress, 1st session, it was recommended that a navigation and hydroelectric dam be built in the vicinity of Bonneville as the first and ultimate downstream project. No specific location was indicated since sites at Warrendale, Bonneville, and Cascade Rapids were under study as possible locations for this first and ultimate downstream dam.

Initial start of construction of Bonneville Dam was not formally authorized by Congress through usual congressional procedures. Its construction was ordered by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by authority given under provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Construction began September 30, 1933, as Federal Project No. 28, under the Public Works Administration. Presumably the Corps of Engineers were directed to construct the project for the Public Works Administration and presumably the Corps of Engineers chose Bonneville as the site for the project.

It is generally known and recognized that final plans and specifications for Bonneville Dam had not been made prior to or at the time construction began. Construction was hurriedly initiated in the interest of restoring to normalcy our collapsed economy.

In the first studies of a project in the vicinity of Bonneville, it was proposed that the controlled low water elevation above the dam be established at 54 feet above sea level, and that navigation locks in such a project should be of dimensions providing a lock width of 56 feet, a length of 360 feet with a minimum depth

over sills of 9 feet; such locks being then regarded as adequate for shallow-draft navigation.

Because of better foundation conditions at Bonneville, it was decided to locate the project at that point and also because it was determined that by building at that point the height of the dam could be increased to such an extent as to provide for control of a normal low water elevation of 72 feet above sea level, thus giving greater power capability. The project was so designed and built.

By this change, the back-water effect was to establish low-water controlled elevation at The Dalles, 45 miles above Bonneville Dam, 26 feet greater than the normal low-water elevation of the river on an uncontrolled basis or, in other words, adding 26 feet in depth to the then existing channel at The Dalles. A dam with a height of 54 feet at Bonneville would have produced a back water increase of only 18 feet.

The change produced a navigational advantage above the dam comparable, in depth and width, with the ship channel from Portland to the sea. This advantage was quickly recognized by all communities east of the Cascade Mountains.

Even with the navigational advantage of greater depth and width, to be created by the dam, the Corps of Engineers, when requested to change the specification of the navigation locks from those for shallow draft navigation to those adequate for deep draft navigation, stated that such change could not be made without an act of Congress, and here is where the battle began to preserve the advantage being created by the project.

Petitions were filed with the Public Works Administration to change the frozen specifications for the navigation lock. They were denied. The people of the interior united to fight the shallow-draft navigation locks, it having been ascertained that extension of a deep-draft channel from Vancouver to the dam, over the tidal section, could be provided in the same manner as the channel had been made from Vancouver and Portland to the sea.

A resolution of the House of Representatives was finally adopted in January 1934, directing the Army engineers to report upon the feasibility of installing a ship lock in Bonneville Dam adequate for a draft of 30 feet. A hearing was ordered and held, under this resolution, before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, at The Dalles, Oreg., on May 31, 1934, when economic justification was cited by many witnesses, representing a diversity of interests in all of the area from the Cascade Mountains eastward, an empire of 200,000 square miles.

No decision to alter the specifications of the locks was made until after President Roosevelt visited the project in August 1934. In a speech made at the project, among other things, the President said, "I hope it will be found the part of wisdom to install ship locks in this dam at this time, so that navigation may be extended to the interior." Following this statement, construction of ship locks was begun.

By insisting that the navigational advantage created by Bonneville Dam be preserved and made usable, we today have a ship lock, with dimensions of a width of 76 feet, not 56 feet, as first proposed; of a clear length of 500 feet, not 360 feet; and a depth over upper sill of 32 feet, not 9 feet; and a depth over lower sill of 26 feet, not 9 feet. Even these expanded specifications have now been found to be, in some respects, inadequate for even shallow-draft navigation since they are not suitable for movement of barges when nested, as is the practice on the Mississippi and other rivers. These specifications, as to width and length, are below those adopted for McNary Dam and The Dalles Dam, where width is now 86 feet, against Bonneville of 76 feet; and length 675 feet against Bonneville 500 feet. Depth over sills is more restricted in these dams than at Bonneville.

It is proper to note at this point that Bonneville Dam was formally authorized as a Rivers and Harbors project by the act of August 30, 1935, or about 2 years after its construction began as a Federal project, under the Public Works Administration.

Ship channel project—Vancouver to Bonneville

Following change in specification of locks at Bonneville and the recognition that the Columbia River could be made navigable for deep-draft vessels, as well as shallow draft, from the sea to The Dalles, it became necessary to obtain adoption of a project to provide for the extension of the then existing ship channel from Vancouver, Wash. to Bonneville Dam.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, by resolution, adopted January 5, 1934, requested the Board of Engineers for Rivers

and Harbors to review the reports on Columbia River, Ore. and Wash., submitted in House Document 103, 73d Congress, 1st session, with a view to providing a channel 30 feet deep, from the mouth of the Willamette River to Bonneville Dam, and locks in said dam suitable for navigation of 30-foot draft.

A report on the engineering and economic feasibility of the ship-channel project was submitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers, in House Document 94, 74th Congress, 2d session, dated April 20, 1936. It is to be noted that full approval of the project was made from the district engineer, through the division engineer and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The requested channel depth was reduced from 30 feet to 27 feet, for reasons set forth in the report.

On August 26, 1937, Congress authorized the construction of a ship channel from Vancouver, Wash., to Bonneville Dam, of a depth of 27 feet and a bottom width of 300 feet.

Through appropriations thereafter made and by construction projects carried on by the Corps of Engineers, excavation to project depth had been completed on May 5, 1943, except for 2 small areas of boulders and cement gravel, where the controlling depth was then 20 feet, as given in a public notice to navigation interests, issued by Col. Donald J. Leehy, then district engineer of the Portland District of the Corps of Engineers. Colonel Leehy also stated in this notice that work was suspended in compliance with orders of the War Production Board as not being essential to war effort at this time.

Since 1946, we have consistently insisted, through our congressional delegation, that sufficient funds be provided to bring the project between Vancouver, Wash., and Bonneville Dam, to full project depth, as authorized by Congress on August 26, 1937.

In a letter to Port of The Dalles Commission, on January 6, 1955, from Col. J. U. Moorehead, district engineer, Portland District, Corps of Engineers, it is stated that the dredging of the main channel between Vancouver and Bonneville, was completed in 1949, to project dimensions of 27 feet deep and bottom width of 300 feet.

It is stated in the above-referred-to letter that this channel at the present time is used for barge transportation and log towing, and is maintained to a depth of 15 feet, which is adequate for existing traffic.

It is also stated, that no construction work on the channel, between Vancouver and The Dalles, is contemplated until the needs of navigation require additional improvements.

It is clearly evident, from this letter, that the Corps of Engineers are not recommending the appropriation of the required funds to complete the ship channel. They are taking the position that they are the judges as to the needs for deep-draft navigation. How can the ports along the upper river promote and establish deep-draft navigation if a channel adequate for such purpose is not provided? There is enough evidence to prove the need for the expanded advantages of deep-draft service.

But this recent statement is but a pyramiding of the changing views of the Corps of Engineers, as to the need for the full completion of the ship channel. The issue now is the correction of alinement of channel above Bonneville Dam, which the engineers insist must be made before they will recommend restoration of the section of the channel from Vancouver to Bonneville to full authorized project depth. We now discuss this situation under the following topic.

Ship channel alinement, Bonneville to The Dalles

In House Document No. 94, 74th Congress, 2d session, April 20, 1936, the then district engineer stated, on page 47, paragraph 109, as follows: "It appears that ship navigation may also require the straightening of the channel just above Eagle Creek to eliminate a sharp turn and reduce cross currents, and some further work of a minor character may be found necessary at and above the Cascade Rapids. The amount of such additional work is not large and is included in the allowance for contingencies in the cost estimate."

But this improvement that could and should have been made was not undertaken and no indication was ever given to any of the public interests that the improvements would not be made.

The need for congressional authorization to do this work, which it was contemplated would be done while Bonneville was under construction, did not show up until a resolution was adopted by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, on December 21, 1944, wherein the Army engineers were requested to review the reports previously submitted on Columbia River

between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg., with a view to determining whether it is desirable to provide additional improvement in the interest of navigation and commerce. A public hearing was held by the district engineer, at Hood River, Oreg., on April 19, 1945, in accordance with this resolution.

As a result of this procedure, it is shown in Report 2009, dated May 13, 1946, 79th Congress, 2d session, in support of River and Harbor bill H. R. 6407, wherein it is stated, on page 53, that a report was authorized by Senate Commerce Committee resolutions, adopted December 3, 1935, April 11, 1939, and July 10, 1945, and Rivers and Harbors Resolutions, adopted April 13, 1939, and December 1, 1944, on plan of recommended modification of existing project. It extends this to state that modification of existing projects for Columbia River, between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg., is to provide the following:

"(a) For channel 27 feet deep at adopted low water and 300 feet wide between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg. (This item provides for channel excavation above Bonneville.)"

This project, among others in the bill, was approved in the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946.

This in effect then was to authorize an improvement that could and should have been made while Bonneville Dam was under construction, the need of which was then recognized as heretofore shown.

Since 1946, we have consistently and persistently endeavored to secure appropriations adequate not only to complete the work authorized above Bonneville, but below Bonneville as well. Appropriations were finally obtained to clean up the job below Bonneville, which Colonel Moorhead reported in January of this year was actually finished in 1949.

On February 8, 1949, we were advised by Senator Cordon that the President's budget of that period did not include any money for the channel above Bonneville.

On August 16, 1949, the district engineer at Portland stated that funds for completion of the ship channel, Vancouver to Bonneville, had been included in his budget estimates.

On August 7, 1949, Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers advised Senator Cordon that the Corps of Engineers was aware of the importance of the improvement and gave assurance that budget estimates of the Army engineers would give consideration to the project.

January 1950, Senator Cordon advised us that President's budget for rivers and harbors construction in Oregon did not contain any estimate for completion of the ship channel, between Bonneville Dam and The Dalles, or for maintenance work to bring the ship channel to project depth between Vancouver and Bonneville.

On February 10, 1950, General Bragdon, then Acting Chief of Engineers, informed Congressman Stockman, in answer to his letter of January 31, that the Corps of Engineers recognized the importance of the project from Vancouver to The Dalles, and gave assurance that in connection with the preparation of appropriation estimates for the fiscal year 1952, our project would be given full consideration.

On February 15, 1950, Colonel Burns, district engineer, informed Congressman Stockman that there was no need for maintenance funds below Bonneville, unless the channel was brought to project specifications above Bonneville Dam, but that estimates for the requirements for this section would be included in the 1952 fiscal year estimates.

From 1950, down to the present, all efforts to get the channel completed have met with failure.

But, there is now a new aspect and it is a shift in the thinking of the Army engineers, as to the desirability of establishing a ship channel. In a letter of August 30, 1950, addressed to me by Colonel Burns, then district engineer, at Portland, it was indicated that a survey as to the possible use of the ship channel was to be undertaken. Here is complete reversal from all reports on the economic value of the ship channel to the interior. And some of these doubts were raised by competitive interests at lower Columbia River ports, which fear the economic effect of extension of deep draft shipping inland to The Dalles, Oreg. It is an opposition not to be disregarded in its effect upon the required appropriations.

Just to show what could have been done in the way of extension of ocean vessels, we submit with this statement a copy of press article appearing in The Dalles Chronicle, under date of October 24, 1945. In this article it is reported that the Pacific coast manager of the Commodity Credit Corporation stated that only the fact that the Army engineers reported that the Columbia River ship channel beween Vancouver and Bonneville had filled with silt, prevents the movement

of wheat from the port of The Dalles by ocean freighter. It is stated that it was planned to send at least two ships to The Dalles. Here it can be seen what happened to full establishment of ocean operation as far inland as The Dalles. Here the opportunity to extend the benefits created by Bonneville Dam were dissipated and destroyed by continuous delays in construction of the ship channel and in spirit of accomplishment of a project fully authorized by Congress.

But our anxiety over completion of the project grows deeper as we hear rumors that some authorized projects throughout the Nation, and that includes ours, may be deauthorized on the basis of lack of need or because of financial retrenchment.

There are other indications that the whole Federal navigation program is threatened by a new policy that would destroy a waterways program of this Nation long established, and one that has contributed to the development of the Nation in the movement of its commerce, domestic and foreign, at the lowest possible cost.

REGIONAL BENEFITS CREATED BY SHIP CHANNEL

Before Bonneville Dam was constructed and its low-water elevation established, the Columbia River, in its natural channel, between The Dalles and the head of tide at Bonneville, was a cascading stream with a sharp fall, terminating in rapids at Cascade locks. Here, in the early days, a lock and canal was constructed so as to permit through steamboat navigation, between lower river ports and The Dalles.

Bonneville Dam with its controlled low-water elevation wiped out all of these obstacles. It superimposed upon the natural channel a new water level of navigable depth and width adequate for deep-draft navigation. Here was a great river change, and here in effect was the extension of a deep-draft waterway through a major mountain range to the boundary of the vast empire between the Cascade and Rocky Mountains. It is a unique waterway improvement, perhaps unexcelled anywhere in this Nation, if not in the world.

This waterway is important in the development of a vast region. The drainage area of the entire Columbia River system, within the United States, is approximately 220,000 square miles. Of this amount, nine-tenths, or 200,000 square miles, is the mountain barricade region lying between the Cascade and Rocky Mountains. The Columbia River is the only water outlet for all of this vast domain. It is the water-level route between the interior and the sea. The extension of ocean commerce of the world to this vast domain can be nothing less than of high economic importance to its present and future welfare.

The region east of the Cascade Mountains is one of fertile and productive lands with high productivity. It is a region with great stands of native forests and one of great mineral resources above and beneath the surface.

It was the extent of these vast resources that compelled the finding that a ship channel up the Columbia River was economically justified. It was the recognition also that the production of the area is far more than it consumes and that markets for this production must be found beyond the borders of the region in other markets of this country and the world. Transportation is a vital cost factor in marketing of the products in distant markets.

Surely the economic importance of the project so ably determined in 1934, is greater today than when the project was first authorized. In this region there have been many changes, all adding economic strength to the region. Here, more hydroelectric projects have been completed and more are in the building. Here, 1 million acres of arid land are coming into full production by irrigation and here great industrial expansion has taken place. Why there can be any doubt as to economic value of the ship channel is beyond us, but still doubt persists in official quarters as to the need for the improvement. It is an attitude of wait and see. But ocean commerce cannot be promoted without the channel, so until it is completed the development that it would afford cannot be accomplished.

CONCLUSION

As indicated in the first topic of this statement, the issue is one of adequate appropriations to rectify the ship channel alinement above Bonneville, a project that should have been completed while Bonneville Dam was under construction. Without this improvement the investment in the ship channel excavation between Vancouver and Bonneville Dam is wasted, and the ship lock in Bonneville Dam of no use for ocean navigation. Again, we must emphasize that we cannot promote and develop ocean commerce without the way. The way can only come by

bold action in building in advance what can and will be used tomorrow in the forward development of the interior Columbia Basin area.

TALENT DIVISION, ROGUE RIVER PROJECT, OREGON, CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

In August 1954 this project was authorized for construction. It involves an extension and rehabilitation of the works of the Talent Irrigation District for irrigation, flood control and electric power. The total project cost is estimated at $20,560,855.

The basic feasibility planning on the project is complete, and the detailed planning is scheduled for completion in June 1955. Construction on several segments of the project can be undertaken during the fiscal year 1956, upon the signing of a repayment contract by the Talent Division water users.

The project feasibility report, including the preliminary land classification, has been completed.

Over the years the irrigation and power features will involve no cost to the Federal Government. The power investment will be repaid, with interest, in 49 years. Thereafter, power, as well as irrigation revenues, will be applied against the cost of irrigation. A complete payment will be realized in about 60 years.

Construction can be initiated with an appropriation of $2,500,000, and the work can be completed in approximately 6 years. To illustrate, during the fiscal year 1956, construction can begin on the Howard Praire Dam and Reservoir, the south fork collection canal, the Big Draw collection canal, the Howard Prairie delivery canal, the Ashland lateral, east lateral, and the Green Springs powerplant.

Unfortunately, the President made no request for construction funds for the Talent project.

The area in which the Talent project is located depends primarily upon agriculture and the logging and lumber industries to sustain its economy. The present supply of irrigation water is now inadequate, making it impossible to realize the valuable harvests and full crop potential which additional water would supply. Construction of the Talent project would relieve this situation and in addition would add 8,640 acres of irrigated land. The storage facilities of the project would afford a much needed and constant supply of water.

A powerplant of 16,000 kilowatts capacity on the project will contribute substantially toward relieving the power shortage of the area and will provide stimulus to new and expanding industry. To make certain that the powerplant installation will be on hand by the time the power drop at the Green Springs location becomes available, it is essential that the contract for powerplant equipment be awarded during the fiscal year 1956.

I strongly urge initiation of construction on this extremely worthwhile project which has the support of local farm and business groups.

AMAZON CREEK, OREG.—PLANNING FUNDS

The Amazon Creek project was modified in 1954 so as to increase the total estimated cost from $617,000 to $894,000. Originally, a tentative allocation of $15,000 in planning funds was indicated by the Army engineers for the fiscal year 1956. I am informed that this tentative allocation has been increased to $22,000 during recent weeks. As a

resident of Lane County, I am familiar with the importance of this project and strongly urge that the item of planning funds be in a sufficient amount to enable the actual allocation of $22,000 in planning funds for this important flood control project.

JOHNSON CREEK—PLANNING FUNDS

The project cost is $519,000. I am advised by the Army engineers that $35,000 will complete planning and permit initiation of construction.

Johnson Creek presents a serious drainage problem to Multnomah and Clackamas Counties. This populous area needs the Johnson Creek project as soon as it can be accomplished.

COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH—CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

In September 1954 this project was modified so as to provide for a 48-foot depth at the mouth of the Columbia instead of the 40-foot depth which had been authorized for over 50 years. The total estimated cost is $8,555,000. I am requesting an appropriation of a million dollars with which to begin the dredging of the channel entrance. As the project continues over a period of between 2 and 3 years, the dredging can be completed and additional contraction works, which includes the possibility of a spur jetty, can be installed.

The economic benefits to Oregon and the Nation will be very substantial when this project is completed. Under the existing situation delays in ship passage through the mouth of the river in rough and stormy weather are extensive. As a consequence, vessel owners reduce cargo tonnage and have to take into consideration the expense of possible "lay time." A 48-foot depth will enable deep-draft vessels to enter and leave the Columbia in comparative safety even during rough weather. The increased depth will provide a substantial incentive to increase shipping.

TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR—CONSTRUCTION

In 1954 Congress authorized this project in the sum of $1,500,000 for the construction of a sand dike in the Bay Ocean Peninsula to prevent further sanding of Tillamook Bay with consequent damage to shipping and waterfront properties in the bay.

The President made no request for construction funds on this project for the fiscal year 1956.

I urge that $250,000 be appropriated for planning and the initiation of construction on the project.

When the authorization of this project was under consideration its importance to shipping and to the economy of the area was clearly demonstrated. A considerable fishing industry has developed in this locality, and it is a natural outlet for the logging and sawmill industries. Oregon and the Nation have an important stake in the improvement of this harbor, and for that reason I urge serious consideration of the appropriation that I have requested.

COOS BAY—CHARLESTON BOAT HARBOR AND CHANNEL—CONSTRUCTION

The problem of shore erosion and the filling in of Charleston Harbor has become intensified in the past few years.

An authorized improvement of the main channel and the construction of a breakwater on the west shore can be completed at an estimated Federal cost of $696,000. Initial work on the project, including the final planning, can be undertaken during fiscal 1956.

I recommend the appropriation of $236,000 for this purpose. Charleston, with a suitable moorage basin protected by a breakwater, constitutes an ideal base for oceangoing fishing craft. Thus its importance to the economy of the area is quite evident.

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL PLANNING FUNDS

There are a number of flood-control, power, and navigation projects in the Pacific Northwest which should be readied for construction. During the past 2 years there has been considerable discussion of the need for expanded public works construction to offset unemployment and to meet possible emergencies.

Unemployment and business distress have become and remained acute in Oregon during the past several years. During most of the winter unemployment was in excess of 10 percent of the labor force; retail sales were down, business failures up. There has been no affirmative offsetting action taken by the administration.

Oregon requires power to expand its economy and public works to carry it over until power capacity is expanded substantially.

Yet the budget contains no funds beyond those specified in the attached summary for planning new projects. Substantial planning must be done before construction can be undertaken on many important flood control, power and harbor developments.

As already presented, planning needs for John Day project vary between $700,000 and $1,500,000. It is earnestly recommended that the higher figure be appropriated and earmarked for John Day with the provision that every unexpended excess be available for other river and harbor projects in the Pacific Northwest.

MOUNTING BACKLOG OF SURVEYS

During the past 2 years there has been an increasing backlog of authorized and unfinanced surveys in my region and throughout the country.

The President requested funds sufficient for only $24,500 for surveys of Oregon projects. The Oregon Slough, Dry Hollow, and Silvies projects should be carried forward.

In addition, it is suggested that another $400,000 be allocated for this purpose. Rich agricultural and forest land is being washed into streams which become obstructed. I have seen this throughout Oregon and recall the critical problems of farmers and businessmen along the banks of swollen streams, for instance, the Yamhill. Elsewhere, harbor facilities are being wasted or filled in by sand and silt.

There are 23 authorized and unfinanced surveys and navigation studies in Oregon alone. The engineers should be free to go forward with those determined to present the most pressing needs.

Despite the growing backlog of unfinanced surveys and studies the administration has requested substantially less ($1,750,000) than was appropriated last year ($2,337,500).

The additional $400,000 for Pacific Northwest projects may well be increased to meet similar needs elsewhere in the country.

SUMMARY

The committee has been most generous in providing for this joint appearance by Senator Neuberger, Congresswoman Green, and me. We have consulted on these appropriation requests and, as their separate statements indicate, the program we advocate is unanimously recommended by us as a minimum one to meet the urgent needs for power and flood control and irrigation in our State and region. Judged by its economic benefits and cash repayments to the United States Treasury, it provides for projects that pay their own way. Some projects do so only indirectly, but their contribution to our State, region, and Nation is nonetheless real.

The administration budget recommendations for power, flood control, and irrigation are an invitation to economic paralysis.

Construction starts on the Hills Creek, Cougar, and Talent projects, full-speed planning for John Day and Green Peter, and our other appropriation recommendations are, we believe, a minimum and reasonable prescription for a preventive economic vaccine.

I have already asked permission, Mr. Chairman, to insert the recapitulation of the appropriation recommended in table form and without taking further time, I shall now, as best I can, answer any questions the committee may have.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Senator Morse and Congresswoman Green for your very fine statements.

Your statements have been most comprehensive, and I want to say that I feel that this committee is sympathetic toward the subject of power, reclamation, and navigation projects. We have had a great deal of testimony from the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of Interior concerning the great Northwest, and as I have personally said, I am impressed with the large degree and amount of progress that has been made in that great area, and the cooperation that seems to be manifest on the part of all.

Everyone who has testified has indicated support and in favor of the budget item.

Senator Morse is a courageous champion of the area he represents, the development of natural resources, and the development of public power for the benefit of his people.

I am in accord with him that the partnership plan, if it is ever to be approved, should not delay the planning funds, that plans should be provided for these essential and vital projects, and whatever may be worked out in the Northwest and in other sections of the country should not be held up by a lack of providing adequate planning funds.

Senator Morse, I wonder if you would tell us—I believe you have touched upon it—the effect of the Bureau of the Budget Regulation A–47, as regards power requirements, which makes it more difficult for power to be developed since that regulation was issued?

Senator MORSE. My discussion of the matter with people in this field is that the Budget Bureau criteria, in effect, prohibit any new starts. The effect is to bring to a standstill new starts under that program. I think it is very unfortunate.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that there is considerable discussion in my State about the danger of power shortages, serious shortages by 1961. In fact, we have got a power shortage now. We already have had brownouts when there is a power shortage; but there is a great concern that unless we get going with new starts, we are going to have very serious shortages by 1961.

When I was home recently I met with officials of the Reynolds Aluminum Co. and they talked to me about the interruptible power problem which they are facing now. That very day, because of Bonneville power curtailment, they were putting on the line a Montana steam plant, in order to get power which they need near Portland.

You can imagine the loss that is entailed in the transmission of power from Montana to Portland. And, of course, these steam plants are uneconomic when compared to hydropower, and which is not integrated with hydroelectric power.

I think it is a nonpartisan issue, as far as getting new starts is concerned. We can have our differences in the future as to the administration and the sale of that power, but I think we ought to join forces in getting the dams and projects planned and getting the planning money in sufficient amounts so we can have them ready in the future.

Mr. EVINS. It is certainly a well recognized principle in hydraulic engineering that steam generation goes along as an auxiliary with hydroelectric generation.

Senator MORSE. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. And in some areas of the country there are people who are opposed to that principle.

Senator MORSE. Out in our section of the country there is a great hydroelectric potential going to waste, and we do not need to develop the steam generation standby——

Mr. EVINS. Let me interrupt at this point, Senator, to say that this committee has had testimony to the effect that in the western section of your State, there are no new possibilities for hydroelectric power starts, but if there are any additional locations, they are to be found in the eastern section of the State, the implication being that the lower alluvial lands in the western portion of the State are not suitable for the building of hydroelectric powerplants.

Senator MORSE. You notice, Mr. Chairman, I had not raised the Hells Canyon issue here today, but your question causes me to go ahead and make this comment: We need, I think, constantly, to keep in mind that the Hells Canyon Dam is of vital concern to the whole series of other dams, in fact, 4 other dams that have been authorized will get from 33 to 48 percent of their power out of Hells Canyon.

I wonder what would happen in this committee and the committee over in the Senate when we come to the time when the request is made for funds for those other dams, and Hells Canyon Dam in the meantime has been destroyed. It would be pretty difficult, it seems to me, if we had to make the argument at the time for us to go ahead and make the dams after we had taken away 33 to 48 percent of the power potential.

Now, I am a strong believer in the orderly development of the so-called threshold dams of which Hells Canyon is one and Libby is another. And then I insist—and it has always been my position—that the private utilities receive from the Federal Government fair contracts for the power that they need off of transmission lines from the muliple-purpose dams to serve their consumers, and also that they receive cooperation in connection with the construction of low-head dams at low-head dam sites. There is not a private utility president in my section of the country who would not raise his right arm and testify here today, if you put the question to him, if you have got a low-head dam site and it does not impinge upon a multiple-purpose dam site, that the Senator from Oregon is willing to go along and help get that low-head dam.

I do not think there is a conflict between the two, as many try to make out. I do not happen to be one of those who favors a Federal monopoly in the development of power. I take that position with reference to Ice Harbor and Hells Canyon; we have got great multiple-purpose sites and I think they ought to be developed fully for future generations.

Mr. EVINS. In other words, where a great multipurpose site appears, foresight and vision would dictate that the Congress provide, whenever it goes forward, for the development of such a project.

Senator MORSE. That is my approach.

Mr. EVINS. We have testimony that there are no such desirable sites in the western portion of your State; that there is just absolutely no more available.

Senator MORSE. Now, you are talking about those exclusive of those we have here under consideration?

Mr. EVINS. I would judge, other than the——

Senator MORSE. Those I have mentioned—Hells Creek, Cougar, Green Peter and some others in the area are primary for flood controls. These have some power features, too.

Mr. EVINS Senator, would you elaborate a little further——

Senator MORSE. May I just interrupt to say that we have quite a few low-head dam sites in the State; that there are quite a few tributaries in Oregon where there are low-head dam sites available and I am for cooperating with the utility companies for the development of them.

Mr. EVINS. In the budget item for Oregon, I notice that $15,000 is indicated for advance engineering on the Amazon River. You feel that is quite inadequate?

Senator MORSE. That is an old friend, Mr. Chairman; it is near my hometown. We have had and have given considerable cooperation on this project from some years past, but have succeeded in getting it only to the present stage. But we need more money. But let me say that it is a small project compared with the other projects, but is of great concern to the city of Eugene, where the Amazon Creek overflows and water goes into the homes of people who live along the creek and does a great deal of damage to property. But it is such a small project, compared with the other two, that we ought to wash it up and get done with it, and get the maximum amount of funds that are needed to finish it up.

Mr. EVINS. Senator, as you know, there is $68,000 in the budget for the Columbia River project.

Senator MORSE. Yes. I was going to say, to go back just a moment, I talked to the Army engineers yesterday on the Amazon Creek and they advise $22,000; I think that is a reasonable request on their part, and I have that in my table at the end, and I strongly urge $22,000 for the Amazon Creek.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will study your table and compare it with the table which has been prepared in the budget, Senator.

There is an item of $68,000 in the budget for the Columbia River project, but I understand that is confined to Idaho, for work in the State of Idaho?

Senator MORSE. Well, I am for Idaho getting that. I think they ought to add to it because I think they have got a problem. We have a national problem here, which is no respecter of State lines. And we have a flood-control problem, and I think it ought to be developed on a regional basis.

Mr. EVINS. You think that $100,000 for advance planning for the Cougar Reservoir—and I do not remember the amount of funds that you requested——

Senator MORSE. The President's request for $100,000 is most inadequate, Mr. Chairman. We are recommending $500,000, and we are recommending that amount because that is what the Army engineers told us they could spend efficiently and economically.

Mr. EVINS. Under "Construction," there are three construction items in all that Northwest area: McNary Dam, $11 million; The Dalles, in Oregon and Washington, $63,500,000 for construction; and the Willamette River Basin, $300,000. Do you care to comment on those?

Senator MORSE. For the Willamette River Basin, it is a bank-control project; it is not a power-development program that McNary and The Dalles are. There should be funds to complete them as quickly as we can do it, to get the generation on the line, so it can start paying for it.

Mr. EVINS. Senator Morse, both you and Mrs. Green have testified with regard to the Ice Harbor project. I understand that this is a rather controversial project. Would you care to elaborate further on your feelings about Ice Harbor?

Senator MORSE. I certainly would not deny that there are controversies connected with it, but if the committee will remember——

Mr. EVINS. The committee is interested in having the information and the facts, of course.

Senator MORSE. But the question is, Is it needed for the development of the 308 program of the Army engineers? It certain is; it is what I have referred to earlier as a threshold dam.

It is a dam whose power capacity and aid to navigation are vital to the maximum development of the Columbia River Basin.

Now, what is the problem in Ice Harbor as far as the major controversy is concerned—fish. Again, I have to rely upon the experts. The experts and the engineers of the other departments satisfy me that we are certainly handling, as well as it can be handled, the fish problem over the dams. The fears of a few years ago have not materialized. The great damage to the fish industry has not been done by the other dams. The fish are getting over the ladders.

But let me be completely frank with you—and I have said this in the fish territory of my State, Astoria—when we look at the economic future of our State; when we see the vital importance of maximum power development to the economic expansion we may have to make a choice, and I have made my choice for the development of the power program because I think the economic future of Oregon is more dependent upon the power program than the fish program.

But let me hasten to add, the fish people have not presented the evidence that caused the experts that are are recommending these dams to sustain their contention that you are going to destroy the fish. The fish industry is not going to be destroyed, I am satisfied, by these dams.

I would point out that we do have in my table of fund requests a substantial item for the lower Columbia fish-sanctuary program, and the appropriation has behind it the support of the fish industry and the fish conservationists, and they feel through this fish sanctuary they can make progress in protecting the fish runs that are important to the region.

Mr. EVINS. You feel that your section of the country will develop more rapidly and make better progress with the development of power, but at this time you think the fish industry is getting ahead?

Senator MORSE. I would not say they are getting ahead. I would simply say that the power people are not getting ahead fast enough.

Mr. EVINS. One further question.

Is it your information that the Talent division was approved in a previous administration by the Bureau of Reclamation and later restudied by the new administration and subsequently it has been approved by the present administration?

Senator MORSE. That is my understanding. I was with some of my colleagues in the delegation under the previous administration when we had a hearing one afternoon with the then Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, and the head of the Bureau of Reclamation, Mike Strauss, because at that time there was not complete unanimity down in the Department of the Interior as to whether we should go on ahead on a segmentized basis.

The Reclamation Bureau had, as I recall—and I am speaking from memory now—what they called plan A, and it was the whole works at once, so to speak, and we in our delegation did not see any justification for holding up parts that were all ready to go in when the development of those parts would in no way be uneconomical, or do damage in the future to the full development of the Rogue River project.

In that conference we came out with a favorable decision from that administration, and the record will show that subsequently they recommended the Talent project on the basis that it was finally authorized. It was reexamined by this administration and again put on the so-called approved list, but funds were not included in the Bureau of the Budget recommendations this year.

Now I speak from hearsay—only partly out of hearsay—because staff members of the Bureau of the Budget explained this to our office. They said they did not have all the data available at the time that the Bureau of the Budget recommendations were submitted to the Con-

gress on the projects for this year, and the Bureau of the Budget staff member said to me:

Senator, we are not against it. It does not mean we are against it. My tip to you is you ought to get it in the form of recommendations because it can be reconsidered when it gets up before the committee and by that time we will probably have the data available we do not have now.

So I respectfully say to you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that I would be very happy to have the committee recheck this matter with the Bureau of the Budget to find out if they would have any objection to at least an appropriation to go ahead with this. I would be very much surprised if you will not find a confirmation of the statement that I have just given you—they did not have all the data available to them at the time when the Bureau of the Budget recommendations came up, but they have no objections to the project. That is their position. I think that you will find there will be no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you. The testimony we have had thus far has been bipartisan in support of the Talent River development.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, may I have the privilege of introducing Mr. Gus Norwood of the Northwest Public Power Association and ask permission that he file with the committee a statement by tomorrow noon for the record?

Mr. EVINS. That permission is granted.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF GUS NORWOOD, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NORTHWEST PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION, RELATING TO FEDERAL LOAN FUNDS FOR HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Gus Norwood. I serve as executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, which consists of 97 consumer-owned electric systems in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Alaska. These electric systems comprise municipal distribution utilities, rural electric cooperatives, and public-utility districts serving about 1,750,000 people, or 35 percent of the region's population.

APPRECIATION

Currently these systems are paying into the United States Treasury over $15 million per year as payment for electric energy produced by such Federal dams as Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Hungry Horse, and others. By 1960 these revenues will reach $30 million. I emphasize these revenues because about 90 percent of all appropriations for Pacific Northwest dams are actually in the nature of Federal loan funds. Only about 10 percent are for flood control and navigation. May I also mention that our Columbia River power system has piled up a cash surplus of over $100 million in the United States Treasury as advance repayment on Federal power investment. These projects are gilt-edge investments.

May I express our appreciation to your committee for past favors—for your leadership as the effective board of directors for this excellent Federal investment program.

GENERAL COMMENTS

During 1955 the Corps of Engineers will dedicate four Pacific Northwest dams: Albeni Falls, Lucky Peak, Lookout Point, and Chief Joseph. Soon these dams will disappear from your budget sheets. But they will remain forever as revenue-producing investments of the Nation.

We are appreciative for and we endorse the President's budget request for McNary Dam and the Dalles Dam totaling $74,500,000. Please note that 92 percent of these funds are for self-liquidating power investment and 8 percent for navigation locks. Your committee should tolerate no reduction in these budget requests because any cut may delay the date of starting the generation

of power. All power is as good as sold. The sooner the dams are completed, the sooner the money comes back into the United States Treasury.

After 1955 the only Federal dam now under construction and waiting to be dedicated is the Dalles Dam in 1958. That is the end of the power program unless this committee reverses the disastrous and shortsighted "no new starts" policy.

In 3 years no new dam has been started. Yet the region's electric load is growing 700,000 kilowatts per year. Yet the Columbia River runs wastefully down to the sea. Eighty-seven percent of its power potential is unused.

UNEMPLOYMENT

While the Nation's economy as a whole appears prosperous, the Pacific Northwest reveals serious spots. Oregon's seasonal unemployment has gotten worse each winter for the past 4 years. The economy of western Montana and northern Idaho has ben shaky, being propped only by the Federal stockpile program. The State of Washington has gotten by largely because of defense employment.

It is my view that chopping of major Federal dam construction will deliver three serious blows to the Northwest economy. Bear in mind that the payroll at The Dalles will peak this summer. Thereafter the appropriations will go mostly to eastern States where the generators are being manufactured.

The first blow to the Northwest economy due to the "No new starts" policy is to the morale of our people. They cannot be optimistic when the Federal Government abandons the development of some of the finest power sites of the Nation.

Secondly, the regional economy is damaged because of the loss of construction payroll.

Thirdly, the economy is hurt by the lack of power and the deep discouragement over the prospects of early relief. After completion of The Dalles Dam in 1961 no new generators are scheduled.

NEW STARTS NEEDED

This committee has the opportunity to keep this national investment program on a sound business basis by two avenues: (*a*) Starting new dams, and (*b*) completing plans to permit new projects to be started.

ICE HARBOR DAM

This association is on record by resolutions in favor of immediate construction of Ice Harbor Dam and navigation locks. This project will produce a quarter million kilowatts.

JOHN DAY DAM

This association is also on record for earliest completion of plans for the John Day Dam and navigation project. This project will produce over 1 million kilowatts. About 92 percent will be self-liquidating power investment.

WILLAMETTE BASIN

Our people are also sympathetic to the development of the Willamette Basin project. Hills Creek, Cougar, and Green Peter Dams are meritorious projects. They are integral portions of the flood-control system for the Willamette Valley. Additionally the power would be appreciated as soon as possible.

COMMENTS ON A–47

I have listened to the discussion on Bureau of the Budget Circular Letter A–47 and wish to comment that this letter has never been satisfactory to us for the following reasons:

(1) A–47 fails to appreciate the greater value of a project when constructed as part of a well-planned, comprehensive, multiple purpose river basin project.

(2) A–47 uses payout periods, generally 50 years, as against Federal Power Commission depreciation basis. We recommend one set of books as per the Federal Power Commission uniform system of accounts. The depreciation funds are used to retire Federal investment.

(3) A–47 advocates interest rates higher than the actual cost of money to the Federal Government.

(4) A–47 rigs the rules against new projects by making it more difficult for the benefits-to-cost ratio to reach the passing mark of 1 over 1.

We think, furthermore, that the subject matter of A–47 is the legislative province of the Congress. Uniform policies and standards are desirable but A–47 appears to be aimed at negating rather than facilitating the orderly and economical development of water resources. This program can meet the most stringent hard money test. But the artificial and unreasonable hurdles of A–47 should be disapproved.

FISH AND POWER

May I comment on the program being made toward the multiple-purpose objective of: both fish and power.

This boils down to fish ladders and how high can they be built and effectively operated.

Briefly the history is as follows: When construction of Bonneville Dam was started in 1933 many felt the 60-foot lift in the fish ladder would be too great. Actually the ladders at Bonneville Dam worked quite well. Over 10 million salmon have climbed these ladders in the past 15 years.

Based on Bonneville Dam experience, the Army constructed the McNary Dam fish ladders for the 80-foot hydraulic lift. These ladders have resting pools midway. The salmon experience at McNary has been good but will be even better when the Dalles Dam provides an easy fish ladder to overcome the Celilo Falls. Buying out the Indian fishing rights at Celilo Falls will increase the upstream movement of salmon by about 65 percent.

Ice Harbor Dam will require a 100-foot lift. I submit that the 60-foot experience at Bonneville Dam and 80-foot experience at McNary Dam points strongly toward a successful fish ladder at Ice Harbor Dam.

Accordingly, we recommend the construction of Ice Harbor Dam together with fish ladders.

CONCLUSION

We are deeply appreciative of the interest of your committee in the Columbia River power system and its multiple-purpose aspects. This is a sound national investment. It is not only self-liquidating but $100 million ahead of repayment schedules.

The electric systems of the Northwest Public Power Association not only endorse the President's budget for McNary and The Dalles Dams, but also urge the starting of Ice Harbor Dam and appropriations to complete planning of John Day Dam. While the association has no resolutions on Cougar, Green Peter, and Hills Creek Dams, I am sure these projects are sound, meritorious, and should be constructed. Power from all these projects is as good as sold.

Senator MORSE. And I would like to introduce Mr. Lee Wooden, who has been one of the great leaders in our State in the REA movement and is now president of the Oregon Electric Co-op Association; and if he cares to, I would like to have permission for him to supplement my statement.

Mr. EVINS. That will be satisfactory.

Senature Neuberger, would you care to make a statement?

Senator NEUBERGER. Thank you very much for your courtesy and kindness.

Mr. EVINS. We appreciate your fine statement, Senator Morse.

Mr. HAND. Senator Morse, you made the interesting statement that by the year 2000 we may have power requirements 20 times in excess of our present requirements.

I ask you if at the same time you have contemplated, as I am sure you have, the possibility that some of our power might be supplied by atomic energy rather than by hydroelectric?

Senator MORSE. There is no doubt about it. None of us speak with finality on that, but as one who is urging the maximum development of hydroelectric power, I certainly felt that I owed it, not only to my State, but the whole country, to satisfy myself as to whether or not I

was proposing at this time a program that may be obsolete 10 years from now, so I have discussed it with the best informants I could find in the atomic energy field and they tell me that there are two things to remember, because they have no fear that atomic energy is going to make obsolete hydroelectric power. They do not see any danger of it developing into cheaper power: if ever, certainly not for decades to come, and second, that what we will have to do is to work out a coordinated program of atomic energy and hydroelectric power development where the two developments will be coordinated. On the basis of the present scientific opinion, I am satisfied that we just cannot hesitate to develop hydroelectric power on the basis of any abstract theory the time may come wherein atomic energy will supplant it.

Mr. HAND. I agree, but you share with me my fear that present developments might become obsolete?

Senator MORSE. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I see by the tables which you and Senator Neuberger and Representative Green have presented to the committee on these projects that under the Ice Harbor Dam, which has already been authorized, you note that in the budget there is no money requested for planning, or new money for anything pertaining to that project.

Can you tell us whether the Army engineers asked funds for this project?

Senator MORSE. I just do not know, Mr. Jensen. Those lists are not made available. I do not think they did. I think it is a matter of their priority list and their hope of getting funds.

Mr. JENSEN. The clerk just informed me that they did not.

Is the same true with respect to the Columbia River at the mouth? It was authorized, but there are no funds requested in the President's budget. Does the same answer apply?

Senator MORSE. The same answer. In that case, I know the engineers did not ask for it.

Mr. JENSEN. Also on the Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Wash., they asked for none?

Senator MORSE. The same answer.

Mr. JENSEN. Is the same true of the Coos Bay project, that there are no funds requested in the President's budget?

Senator MORSE. I do not know, but I think the answer is that there are none.

Mr. JENSEN. So, because of that fact, the budget is in no position to make a request for funds for those projects to the Congress?

Senator MORSE. Will you permit me to make this comment? I think as legislators we have to go into procedure that leads to the presentation of these budgets. Of course, the Army engineers do not work independently of the Bureau of the Budget. They have their consultations. The Army engineers, I think you will find, are not inclined to make recommendations if they are satisfied it is not administration policy. That leaves us with our legislative duty of deciding what is in the public interest. I give great weight to the recommendations of the Army engineers on engineering matters, but when it comes to the determination of the question of policy as to whether funds should or should not be recommended, or appropriated, that is our responsibility.

Mr. JENSEN. Only to this effect, that the Army engineers are no different from any other agency of the Government. I have never found them bashful about asking for budget requests, and I am not condemning them for that. After all, that is their responsibility to do it. I am satisfied that the Army Engineers have urged these projects and the Bureau of the Budget may have cut them down, but they would not cut them out entirely.

Now, according to your recapitulation of appropriations, listing what you have shown on these projects, and the President's budget we find that there is $76,510,000 for these projects in your great State, which is over 90 percent of the amount which you and your colleagues, Senator Neuberger and Representative Green, are requesting of this committee. You are requesting $7,385,050 above the budget, or the amount of $84,395,050 as against the President's budget of $76,510,000. I would say that you are not doing too bad. You are getting over 90 percent of what you think should be allowed. However, I am one member of the committee who is not accusing you people of being gluttonous. You represent your State. I have the Missouri River in my district. It is giving us a lot of trouble, and I have not been a bit bashful about asking for flood-control funds.

Senator MORSE. You should not be.

Mr. JENSEN. For about 10 years we got exactly nothing north of Omaha to Sioux city. We finally are getting that taken care of, for which I am very grateful.

Now, I can assure you as one member of the committee my mind is not closed on your request. You have a great State. You have great people. I have traveled up and down all of those rivers. I have spent a lot of time in Oregon. I have been cussed and discussed and congratulated and everything else, but I have sat on the Interior Appropriations Committee and approved I don't know how many hundreds of millions of dollars for power projects, transmission lines, reclamation projects, and a lot of other things for your great State. I have no excuses for it. I think they were completely justified. I am sure you people appreciate the amount in the budget request of $76,510,000 which you sort of failed to mention in your testimony.

Senator MORSE. May I say most respectfully and good-naturedly I have all the figures including the totals in the chart, and my objection to the administration's figures, is that except for the completion of dams already under construction, there is not a single new kilowatt-hour in their budget, and to me new kilowatts are not only for the economy of Oregon, but Ohio, Iowa, and Massachusetts, and every other State. I hold to the point of view that this is a national economy, and if you build up the economy in Iowa you help Oregon, and vice versa. We have this tremendous power shortage across this country facing us. You will find me supporting the development of power resources outside of my State—in Florida, Massachusetts, the Tennessee Valley, or anywhere else, because I think we are dealing here, gentlemen, with not only a great economic need, but we are dealing here with a great security need also. Not one of us can sit around this table and be sure what our defense needs are going to be 50 years from now. One thing the experts tell us, you can be sure that every kilowatt of power we have available can be put to defense purposes. I am appreciative of what is in the budget, but what I am trying to

point out in this presentation today is that we do not have new starts in an area where you have a great potential for new starts, and where I think you have a sound national investment. That is the sum and substance of it.

Mr. JENSEN. You will admit, Senator Morse, that the first people that must take cognizance of the situation as you explained—and I agree with you—are the Army engineers. If they do not make recommendations to the Bureau of the Budget, which apparently they have not done on these projects, that you list here where no money is requested, then they did not ask for a budget request, and until they do, neither the Budget nor this Congress can do much about it except that there are times, of course, when a committee of Congress will include items that are not in the budget.

Here we have hundreds of people coming in here from almost every other State asking for not only the amount in the budget, but many, many of them are asking for additional amounts. It is no small job to try, as best we can, to recommend to the Congress where this money ought to be spent. It is not the easiest thing in the world to say arbitrarily, "Well, we are going to put this in regardless of whether the Budget requests it or not." As I say again, it has been done. I have recommended it where I thought the Bureau of the Budget and the agency were wrong in not asking for the money; when I thought that it was pennywise and pound foolish. But in this instance, after all, with all due respect to the Army engineers—and they are a great outfit—they have not made the recommendations which you feel money should be appropriated.

Senator MORSE. There is a word that I deeply appreciate in Mr. Jensen's statement. I appreciate the cooperation that we have received from Mr. Jensen on many, many items in the past. I respectfully suggest this to the committee in regard to the matter he has raised about the Army engineers not recommending the funds.

At first, if you will check with the Army engineers as to the feasibility and desirability of the projects, you will find in each instance they will point out they are a part of their comprehensive plan. I think that that is very important because it goes to the second matter that I want to mention.

Has there been a change in the Bureau of the Budget's policy? Has there been a change in the Bureau of the Budget policy in the advice that is given the Government agenices, including the Army engineers? Are we confronted with a factual situation in which the administration has indicated rather clearly to the Army engineers, as well as to the departments, they want their recommendations to be within the framework of administration policy, and the administration has made clear, for example, it wants no new starts? I am not surprised that they are not recommending new starts for that is administration policy.

The Army engineers are great teammates also, and if we have a new policy here from the Bureau of the Budget, which I think we have, and which they have made clear before these departments make their recommendations, I think you have a part of the explanation as to why the Army engineers have not made the recommendations.

What would you say if you put them on the stand and proceeded to cross-examine them on these individual projects and ask them,

"Would you recommend that we go forward with this if you were satisfied that the Congress would have the will, on your recommendation, to supply the funds?" I think that you would get quite a different answer. That is my feeling about it.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course now, Senator, the President has made it very clear that he is for new starts. In fact, he has recommended a number of projects, and so I cannot believe that the Bureau of the Budget has been instructed and the Army engineers have been instructed to institute no new starts.

Senator MORSE. They were so instructed in 1953. They were specifically instructed.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; but the President came out last fall, I think, and recommended a number of new starts.

Senator MORSE. I am confronted with the fact that he has not recommended any in the Pacific Northwest. There have not been any recommendations there. The Congressman has been very kind, and so have the rest of you. I think that I have made my point, and only ask you to go into the matter of whether or not the Army engineers under this administration are not following a more reticent policy in regard to recommendations than they have heretofore.

Mr. HAND. I do not think that my colleague is accusing you of gluttony, he is just accusing you of having a hearty appetite.

Senator MORSE. I do have a hearty appetite. That is why I have all the vitality I have.

Mr. MURRAY. I might say that I was very much impressed by the statement of the able Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Congresswoman from Oregon. We freshmen in Congress felt so much about her that we elected her unanimously as president of our 84th Club. I was particularly impressed with your overall plan.

I might say with respect to the controversy concerning the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget that I, myself, have felt that the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, although they are very capable agencies, cannot help but somehow get the same consideration, or thinking, concerning the requirements of our expanding economy as an administration which may or may not think in the same terms as the Congress.

But the one question that I have in connection with this overall recapitulation is this—when it was made, did you also take into consideration the needs of the entire region, or was this particularized to the State of Oregon?

Senator MORSE. It was taking into account the whole region of development. I have been a strong supporter of the whole master plan which is regional in scope. Ice Harbor itself is in the State of Washington. If you went to some of the other so-called threshold dams, you would find one on the border between Washington and Oregon; you would find Libby in another State entirely.

As I said earlier, this is a regional problem and not just a provincial State problem.

Mr. MURRAY. Thank you.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Senator and Mrs. Green.

Now we will hear from Senator Neuberger.

Senator NEUBERGER. I will be very brief. This is the first time that I have had the privilege of appearing before you and I am not going to be lengthy.

I have a written statement about the projects which I believe should receive funds, as some have not had any allocated for future development in the Pacific Northwest. I say particularly in the Northwest, in answer to your question, Congressman Murray, because many of these important items are shared by the States of Oregon and Washington.

For example, the largest item in here that receives money is the Dalles Dam, which is on the Columbia River between the two States. Next is McNary Dam, which is between the two States.

We are extremely interested in the Columbia River channel improvement, which I think is one of the most needed of the projects, and that is shared by the States of Oregon and Washington equally because the river is the border between the two States.

The committee has been most generous with its time this afternoon, so perhaps I shall leave my statement for you and not belabor it.

Mr. EVINS. Your statement will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER ON FISCAL 1956 APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS AND RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first, let me thank you for this opportunity to present to you some of the most urgent needs for appropriations for public works authorized in Oregon.

You have before you a chart recapitulating the status of projects in Oregon, the appropriations, if any, asked in the President's budget, and the recommendations of Senator Morse, Congresswoman Green, and myself. The statement which has just been introduced by Senator Morse explains in detail our recommendations as set forth in this chart. As he has said in his summary, that statement represents the considered joint judgment and unanimous recommendation of Mrs. Green, himself, and me for a minimum program of progress in the vitally needed development of our State and region.

I would like at this time to discuss a few of these projects which are of very great importance: (1) The need for pressing forward toward construction of authorized multipurpose dams in the Columbia River Basin; (2) the dredging of the authorized 48-foot navigation channel at the mouth of the Columbia River; (3) the Tillamook Bay and Bar project; and (4) a start on the important Talent division of the Rogue River irrigation project.

THE NEED FOR PROGRESS IN MULTIPURPOSE DAMS IN COLUMBIA RIVER SYSTEM

Competent engineers predict that by the year 2000, the Pacific Northwest will require an amount of electric energy equal to more than three Columbia Rivers fully harnessed. We have already waited too long in carrying out the program which will result in the harnessing of one Columbia River.

The advance program of the Bonneville Power Administration indicates the present energy demand of the Pacific Northwest, about 45 billion kilowatt-hours, will expand to 80 billion kilowatt-hours in 1960. These estimates indicate that we cannot proceed too rapidly in expanding the power resources of the region.

At the present time only about one-sixth of the Columbia Basin's waterpower potential has been developed. Yet, this river system contains about 40 percent of the potential hydropower in the United States.

I would like to point out that our ability to maintain our lead in the cold war struggle against communism is dependent on our expansion of industrial strength. Our energy resources, then, must be developed to their maximum to meet this threat.

Maximum development of the Columbia for all multipurpose uses can only be obtained through continuation and acceleration of the Federal program which has electrified the region's farms, increased industrial expansion, provided more jobs and opportunities for private enterprise.

In recent weeks, many people with a sincere interest in the program for Columbia Basin resource development and without any ideological prejudices

about the methods for financing the needed projects have been led to believe that the beneficial objectives or river development can only be obtained through a partnership between the Federal Government and local utilities.

In effect, they have been told by the Eisenhower administration and their former Governor, Secretary McKay, that the Federal Government will not carry through on these authorized projects—such as Cougar and Green Peter Dams, which you need so badly to control the floods which ruin your land—unless Congress changes its mind, deauthorizes these Federal projects, and turns over the profitable power features to local utilities.

At the same time, a thoroughly false impression is deliberately created that, under partnership, these projects could spring into being overnight.

This callous attempt to force Congress and the people of Oregon to accept a shotgun partnership is a type of political blackmail hitherto unheard of on the American scene.

Congress has the repsonsibility of repudiating the administration's pressure tactics. This must be done by approving the funds for the already authorized Federal dam projects which I and my colleagues from the State of Oregon are asking you to consider today. These new starts will be evidence that the Federal Government has not abandoned the program of full and comprehensive development of the Columbia Basin, that Congress recognizes the desirability of the comprehensive multipurpose use of water resources, including the expansion of energy resources needed to safeguard the national welfare.

I would like to take a few minutes to point out the disadvantages and shortcomings of the proposed partnership scheme of the administration.

When he was President, Teddy Roosevelt gave voice to the guiding principle for full, multiple-purpose development of water resources. He said: "Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such." I subscribe to that principle in development of the Columbia River. I do not think we can break up the development of the Columbia and its tributaries into a number of disconnected pieces and achieve the same benefits as would result from following a unified plan.

The partnership scheme is acting as a roadblock to continuing the development by the Federal Government that has been an outstanding success for two decades. The partnership proposals, rather than bringing projects closer to reality, are exploited as deterrents to congressional approval of funds for full Federal construction. If those who avidly support partnership would, instead, spend an equal amount of time and effort to support full Federal construction, we would have projects in the works instead of monkey wrenches.

Partnership power is disadvantageous to the people served by the so-called utility partner because the power would be more expensive. Besides its higher cost power, partnership establishes a number of precedents of dubious value. Since the scheme calls for the property to remain the property of the Federal Government, the local so-called partners would be exempt from payment of local property taxes although they would have the full output of power facilities.

The partnership proposals also give engineers in Federal agencies discretionary power in determining the reimbursable power costs of the project. Is it desirable, from the standpoint of Government operations, to set up a system by which extraordinary pressures might be exerted on people making the cost allocations so that they would favor the utility playing the partnership role?

Partnership makes it difficult to determine who owns what. As you know, the commingling of public and private funds is contrary to a basic idea of American Government. The objections to "business in Government" are as imposing as the objections to "Government in business."

Partnership also would add to administrative inefficiency. It raises the question of who will make what decisions. Beginning with initial planning and carried through the plant operation, the Federal Government and the utility partners may see different obligations, different objectives, different purposes for operation of a dam. One can only assume that if the utility partner felt it was injured, its grievance would be carried to a court of law. Lawsuits are a most ineffective and inefficient method of administering the water resources of the Columbia Basin.

With all these disadvantages and shortcomings, the national administration continues to paint its partnership in glowing terms. Congress can prevent the citizens of the Northwest from being led down the primrose path of partnership by providing funds for the Federal program we advance here today.

Accordingly, I want to urge you most strongly to include appropriations of $1,500,000 for John Day Dam, $200,000 for Green Peter Dam, $500,000 for Cougar Dam, and $2 million for construction of Hills Creek Dam, the only project in the Williamette Valley which is ready for an almost immediate start on construction.

DEEPENING THE CHANNEL AT THE MOUTH OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER TO AUTHORIZED PROJECT DEPTH OF 48 FEET

I particularly want to stress the urgency of moving ahead with the greatest possible speed with the deepening of the channel at the mouth of the Columbia River.

This year marks the end of half a century since the Congress authorized the existing 40-foot, half-mile dimensions for the entrance to this mighty river. Those 50 years have brought enormous changes to the Pacific Northwest area served by water transportation on the river, and they have brought changes in the nature of the shipping itself. While vessels have become ever larger, with deeper drafts, and the volume of shipping has multiplied, physical changes in the Columbia bar have made negotiation of even the old channel ever more difficult and hazardous.

Recognition of the great need to bring the access to the Columbia up to date with the increased demands made upon it led Congress last year to authorize the deepening and straightening of the entrance channel to a half-mile width of 48 feet depth. This authorization was based on an exhaustive report by the Corps of Army Engineers; and in view of the comprehensive study which the Congress has so recently given to this subject, I want at this time only to review some of the most compelling facts from the report.

1. The Pacific Northwest has been and continues to be an area of phenomenal population growth, with resulting economic and commercial expansion. Due to the high cost of long-distance overland transportation, particularly across the mountain ranges of the West, water transportation is of primary importance to the economy of the region.

As illustrative of the products shipped in bulk on the Columbia, I may mention only lumber, paper, grain and fruit products outbound, and inbound, petroleum and minerals, such as bauxite for the aluminum plants of the region. Anyone who knows the Pacific Northwest will immediately recognize the vital role which the safety, speed and cost of transporting such materials as these play in our economy.

2. The ports of the Columbia River constitute one of the major seaport systems of the world, regularly served by 40 worldwide lines as well as coastwise, petroleum and other special carriers. Ocean commerce across the bar of the Columbia has increased to 10 times the volume it had when the existing channel was authorized by Congress—from 947,000 tons to 9,214,000 in 1950. This immense growth in seaborne commerce has taken the form of more voyages by larger ships through the old channel. Thus, during the same period, the number of ship passages has risen from about 1,400 to 3,270 in 1950, with the average size of the ships increased from 1,186 to 4,544 registered tons.

3. The postwar trend toward larger ships with greater drafts has made the present entrance to the Columbia dangerous, particularly in heavy weather. When the 40-foot minimum was established in 1905, no ships on the Columbia drew more than 28 feet. In 1925, 70 ships crossed the bar with actual drafts of 28 or more feet; in 1940, 96 (3 percent of the total); but in 1950, 803 (25 percent of the total). The engineers report that: "When storm waves are running, modern vessels may strike bottom in depths exceeding their draft by 15 feet or more, * * * the present depth * * * is not sufficient for safe passage of present-day deep draft vessels."

Not only have there been a substantial number of groundings in the mouth of the Columbia in recent years, at losses running to hundreds of thousands of dollars; knowledge of the danger of crossing the bar in rough seas causes many ships to delay their arrival at the bar, or to be held for safer conditions. The engineers have estimated the cost of these delays alone at $88,000 a year—a sum that will grow as deep-draft shipping to the Columbia River ports increases.

4. Considerable additional tonnage is lost when ships, particularly tankers, are loaded to less than full capacity so as to avoid the risk of damage or delay in crossing the bar. In other words, operators of modern oceangoing ships and tankers face the alternatives of either deliberately taking a loss on their tonnage by loading to less than full capacity, or risking a potential loss through delay at the bar, or worse.

The engineers' report calculated the direct annual benefits to be derived from a 48-foot entrance channel to the Columbia River at $382,800 now, and an average of $574,200 a year over the next 50 years. Many additional indirect benefits are listed in the report but not evaluated.

The above facts alone are enough to show that any delay in carrying out the authorization of a 48-foot channel which the Congress voted last year would inexcusably perpetuate a serious barrier to the economic growth of the Northwest, and to the commerce of the rest of the Nation with the Northwest. To them, there must be added the compelling considerations of national security.

I shall not recite today the recordbreaking accomplishments of the wartime shipyards in Portland and Vancouver, or the volume of shipping which placed Portland well within the top 10 ports of the Nation in defense shipments. But we must face the fact that the ports of the Columbia River will not in the future be able to play the crucial role they did in the Second World War, if they continue to be bottled up behind the treacherous shoals of the present bar.

The people of the Portland-Vancouver area—a metropolitan area of well over half a million population—continue to manifest their own confidence in the future of the Columbia as a main artery of American and world trade. On Swan Island, they have built some of the finest drydock and ship repair facilities in the country. In last year's elections, the port of Portland won adoption of a bond issue of $6,500,000 for modernization and improvements of the Portland docks.

These new, as well as existing, facilities will stand ready to load and unload, to build, repair and service ships for commerce and for the needs of national defense—ready, that is, to serve the ships that can reach them. Congress must not delay in carrying out the responsibility for keeping open the shipping lanes to these great ports, which it recognized in authorizing the 48-foot entrance channel last year.

The project authorized last year calls for dredging a half-mile channel to a depth of 48 feet at a total cost of $2,898,000. After completion of the channel, and on the basis of a study of currents and other conditions affecting annual shoaling of the new river entrance, the channel is to be secured by a spur jetty estimated to cost $5,657,000.

Of this total project cost of $8,555,000, only $1 million is needed at once for the first year's work. This sum will be sufficient to permit the engineers to complete their plans, initiate the project and carry out the first year's dredging work.

It is essential that this dredging, which is dependent in any case on unpredictable weather conditions, be permitted to proceed with all speed physically possible—that it not be unnecessarily delayed by inadequate funds. It may prove impossible to complete the maximum contemplated work in the first year, but it is essential that the engineers be given the means to try. Unspent funds are not lost, and they will in any case be needed the following year.

Consequently, I urge that the full $1 million be appropriated for the project of dredging the entrance channel of the Columbia River to the project depth of 48 feet.

TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR

I would like at this time to make special mention of only one of the several important projects on the Pacific coast of Oregon—another project which was authorized by the Congress last year, in order to forestall the threat of virtual loss of the harbor at Tillamook. Following this authorization last year, the local population has shown its own determination to save this harbor by meeting the contingency of a local contribution of a quarter million dollars. I request that in the budget for fiscal 1956 Congress match this sum by appropriating $250,000 to start the work of closing the gaping break in the Bayocean Peninsula before irreparable damage is done.

As pointed out in the report of the Corps of Engineers last year, if an early closure of the breakthrough in Bayocean Peninsula is not made, greater deterioration of the navigation channels is inevitable, more acreage of oyster lands will be destroyed, and dikes protecting valuable agriculture lands will be subjected to damage by increased wave action along the easterly side of the bay.

With conditions as they are now, closure would not be difficult. Every passing week and every passing month means a more costly and a more difficult task will be faced as the sea cuts a wider and deeper outflow channel.

Deterioration of the navigation channels is choking off the movement of shipping in and out of the harbor. Continued deterioration will shortly imperil even the movement of fishing vessels. It is even reported that the movement of logs out of streams and across the bay has become a problem because of the rapid silting.

Preservation and protection of the existing navigation project and of the auxiliary channel, it was stated last year by the Corps of Engineers, would result in benefits of $198,000 annually to the public. It was further pointed out at that time that protection of the remaining oyster beds would result in annual benefits to local interests of $22,450.

It is estimated the construction cost of closing the breach in Bayocean Peninsula would be $1,750,000. I understand that the Corps of Engineers believe construction can be accomplished in one working season, March to October, inclusive, which would require allotment of $250,000 of Federal funds in the fiscal year 1956 and $1,250,000 in fiscal year 1957.

I can emphasize the importance of speed in carrying out this project in no more forceful language than the Corps of Engineers used in their report last year when they said in summation: "For these reasons it is believed that authorization of the project and appropriation of funds therefor should be given a high priority." And in reference to the estimated costs they said, "This expenditure, plus the costs to local interests, appears to be amply justified economically on the basis of Federal and non-Federal benefits." Time is of the essence if construction costs are to be kept to a minimum and further damage prevented.

TALENT DIVISION OF THE ROGUE RIVER IRRIGATION PROJECT

I now turn to a project, not of the Corps of Engineers, but of the Bureau of Reclamation, the fate of which between athorization and budgeting is, to my mind, a telling example of the gap between political promises and performance. I refer to the Talent Division of the Rogue River Basin irrigation and power project.

When the Talent project was authorized by Congress last year, the Republican Party in Oregon took the occasion for speeches and celebrations in the campaign to drum up Republican votes in the fall election. To listen to Republican orators, the people of Oregon would think, as they were meant to think, that this important project—which has the support of Oregonians of all persuasions—was on the threshold of fruition. My opponent, representing the Republican administration, told the people of southern Oregon that construction of the Talent project was routine from here on in.

Yet, when the Eisenhower budget for fiscal 1956 was unveiled, it did not contain 1 penny for construction of the Talent project. At the time the administration's budget appeared, a news report by Mr. A. Robert Smith to a number of Oregon newspapers quoted "a high administration official" as saying that new starts on reclamation projects were limited to adjoining Western States in which Republicans had been successful last November.

The Talent project deserves better than to evaporate like a political mirage. It is a sound project which will irrigate 8,640 new acres of dry lands and make available needed supplemental water to 9,250 acres in an agricultural area of many small farms. In addition, it would have important flood-control benefits, and the plan calls for a powerplant of a capacity of 16,000 kilowatts.

Of the total estimated cost of a little over $20 million about 60 percent is allocated to irrigation and 30 percent to power. The power investment will be repaid with interest over a period of 49 years, after which power revenues will be added to irrigation revenues to bring about total amortization of the project about 60 years from construction.

On behalf of the people of southern Oregon, to whom authorization of the Talent irrigation project last year meant the promise of long-sought economic development, I request an initial appropriation for construction in the amount of $2,500,000. This amount is the minimum necessary to permit completion of the project over a period of about 6 years. In addition to starting a number of canals and reservoirs, it will make possible beginning construction of the Green Springs powerplant and contract commitments for power equipment, which must be made now to be ready when needed.

As one of the fastest growing States in the Nation, Oregon needs sound and continuous development of its rich natural resources to keep up with its growth in population. Such resource development should not be allowed to become a victim of political drumbeating in the summer of an election campaign and political allocation of funds in the budget of the following winter. It is up to this Democratic 84th Congress to redeem the forgotten Republican promises to the people of the Rogue River Basin and to appropriate these funds for a start on construction of the Talent division of the Rogue River project.

In conclusion, let me again express my appreciation for your attention to these important projects. The people of Oregon have high hopes and confidence that this 84th Congress will not permit the administration's abandonment of sound, multipurpose resource development to cause economic stagnation in the Northwest. Let us not disappoint that confidence. Only by continuing such development on the schedule we have outlined can that rich and growing region make its full potential contribution to the economic welfare and the security of our Nation.

Senator NEUBERGER. In addition to my statement, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment very briefly on a number of things.

Mr. Hand, you raised the point about atomic energy. There was recently a story in the New York Times pointing out in their business section that atomic energy is a longways from competing with other sources of energy for several reasons, particularly cost.

I would like to point out this one—we have very limited supplies of pitchblende in the world which is the highest grade of ore from which materials for atomic energy come, and it would seem to me until we develop sources of such materials—and right now we are drawing upon the Belgian Congo and the area of Great Bear Lake—it would be very foolish for us to rely on those liimted sources for energy when we could use falling water which goes on forever; at least, not until we have vast new supplies of ores that do produce atomic energy.

I noticed two stories in the New York Times recently by Michael Hoffman from Geneva. The European nations had an emergency conference on their industrial future, and they found out that they are limited because of the fact they do not have enough energy, electrical energy, and they do not know where they are going to get the energy that is needed. It seems to me when we have these great sources of energy in our own country where energy can be developed without using up resources such as coal, or oil, or waiting for uranium we ought to consider them.

I noticed a story in the New York Times that the country of Egypt, which, compared to our own development, some people would suppose to be a backward nation, is going to build on the headwaters of the Nile the biggest dam in the world, larger than Grand Coulee, and that that dam will increase the agricultural production about 33 percent and their power production about 40 percent. It seemed to me quite interesting that a nation which is sometimes thought of as a relative late comer in industrial and economic development is going to build the biggest dam in the world, and here we are renouncing some of our own valuable power sites. It seems an interesting contrast.

It may be possible that some of our funds which we will not appropriate here for our great power sites may be going into the project in Egypt.

Mr. HAND. Did you say, "It may be possible"?

Senator NEUBERGER. Only having been here 4 months, I am not yet an expert on Egypt.

I noticed that the name of this dam in Egypt is Sadd el Ali. I think it is quite interesting while Egypt is going to build Sadd el Ali, meaning the high dam in the Egyptian langauge, we in the United States are going to have no Sadd el Ali. I think that is rather interesting and somewhat ironic.

I am not going to talk about power any more because I know that my colleague in the Senate and Mrs. Greene are better informed on

that than almost anyone whom I know, and I am sure they have well informed you.

I want to mention for about 2 minutes the Columbia River Channel situation. The Columbia River is the second greatest river in the United States, second only to the Missouri-Mississippi River system. It seems to me a very disastrous thing to leave that great river channel at 40 feet. It was authorized at 40 feet in 1905, and you gentlemen can imagine what the size of ships must have been in 1905. Today it is only 40 feet. It has been authorized to 48 feet, but the actual work on it is only at 40 to 42 feet.

The Army engineers, who Mr. Jensen was referring to, have reported—

> When storm waves are running, modern vessels may strike bottom at depths exceeding their draft by 15 feet or more. The present depth is not sufficient for safe passage of present-day deep draft vessels.

There is the second greatest river in the United States and the only navigable river on the whole Pacific seaboard. This is something I know a little about, among some of these things that we in politics talk about.

In 1953 Mrs. Neuberger and I went out and spent some time on the dredge that is out at the mouth of the channel, and we spent a great deal of time with the captain on the bridge. He showed us freighters coming across that bar, which is one of the most dangerous bars in all the world. I think more ships have grounded on that bar than almost any other bar, at least in proportion to the tonnage. In fact, the second ship that was brought there, the Tonquin, which was John Jacob Astor's ship, could not come across the bar because it was so stormy. That was back in 1811.

The captain of the dredge, the dredge *Biddle*, showed us these great freighters coming in, and they would sound in the great whirling waves. He told us that some of those freighters were within 15 feet of the bottom. He said that the largest freighters and tankers did not dare come in because they might have the bottom of their hulls ripped open on the bar.

The day we were there was a nice day. He said that there were weeks spent sometimes when even the largest vessels that use the river, though they are far from the heaviest tonnage that could come in if the river were dredged, would have to stand off there for days and weeks until the weather moderated.

I thing that a start ought to be made on deepening the channel of this great river on our western seaboard, the second greatest river in the United States, to 48 feet.

The total cost of that project will eventually be $8,500,000, but the dredging itself will cost only $2,900,000. It is my understanding it could well be gotten under way within a $1 million appropriation and the value to the whole Pacific coast, in terms of commerce, exports, navigation, to say nothing of national security, would be very profound.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. May I state that your testimony has been particularly refreshing to me. It has been stimulating. It shows your imagination and vision of the future needs of our country.

When you were speaking of Egypt I was reminded of the fact that President Eisenhower sent over Mr. Eric Johnston, the former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, to the Near East with a personal mission to find out what our country could no to help those people over there so they might get ahead. Mr. Johnston came back and recommended a series of dams on the ancient Jordan River. I read that in the press. I happened to meet Mr. Johnston at a meeting in Washington and I talked to him personally about that press account and he said, "You may quote me. That is the true situation. I confirm the need for it."

That was for the building of a series of dams on the ancient Jordan River. We do appreciate your testimony.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

TRINITY RIVER DEVELOPMENT

WITNESS

HON. JIM WRIGHT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. EVINS. It is indeed a pleasure to have with us today our colleague from Texas, Congressman Wright. His earnest advocacy and zeal in connection with the Trinity River development has made a lasting impression on all of us.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I think I can appreciate the awesome responsibility which your committee must feel, when besieged by pleas and importunings to insure that from each appropriated tax dollar a full dollar's worth of benefit will inure to the people of the United States.

I understand it to be your policy to apply Federal funds where they will truly serve the national interest, and where preferably there is a clear disposition on the part of the local interests to put their own shoulders to the oar and contribute effectively to the development of the overall program in which our Federal Government participates.

By either criterion, the projects appearing in the suggested budget for the further development of the Trinity River in Texas recommend themselves to your sympathetic consideration.

The 12-million-acre area embraced by the Trinity River watershed has a significant role in the realization of the economic potential of the United States. Few areas indeed have recently experienced such a rapid rate of industrial growth. Few if any have as much to offer in undeveloped potential.

On the upper reaches of the Trinity basin, more than 1 million people populate the Fort Worth-Dallas area which is the center of great north Texas aviation industry. Where the Trinity empties into the Gulf of Mexico, metropolitan Houston with more than 1 million people in its own right mushrooms out to touch almost contiguous municipalities where the oil and chemical industries so vital to our national welfare have taken root.

Between and surrounding these centers lies an area in which the past 5 years have furnished conclusive proof that development and conservation of the water which falls upon its sprawling acres is infinitely more important in the final analysis than the discovery of oil, gold, uranium, or any other natural resource.

As this area's development is vital to the national economy, so the development of the Trinity is indispensable to the economic life of the area.

You will be interested, I am sure, in the truly unrivaled record of public-spirited self-help which has characterized that portion of the Trinity River development which has heretofore been accomplished.

More than 40 years ago, local interests first dreamed of a master plan for the control of the ravaging floods and the utilization of the surface resources to encompass the full length of the Trinity and its major tributaries. They went to work upon their own initiative, and for many years they worked alone, laboriously and painstakingly etching out one step at a time in the construction of levees and floodways and reservoirs.

Finally, under the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the rivers and harbors authorization of 1945, the Federal Government took official cognizance of the need and the opportunity and launched in cooperation with local authorities the largest really intensive watershed program in the Nation.

As a result of these years of cooperative endeavor, the goals contemplated for the upper one-third of the Trinity watershed have largely been achieved. Their accomplishment is an outstanding tribute to local-Federal cooperation.

There are nine major reservoirs serving the purpose of main-stem flood control on the upper tributaries. Together, they represent a $105,200,000 investment. Of this amount, $56,600,000—or substantially more than half—is attributable to local investment. When we consider separately the four reservoirs above Fort Worth, where the 1949 flood took a terrible toll in property, 72 percent of the total existing reservoir value was provided locally.

Taking into account the levees and floodways which serve the interest of flood control in the area of the 9 reservoirs, the local investment is $144 million compared with $61,200,000 in Federal expenditures. This record of local participation is unmatched on any major watershed program in the United States.

The first phase of the Trinity master plan upon which local and Federal authorities jointly embarked is nearing completion. By any standard, it measures up as a huge success and a magnificently good investment from the Federal viewpoint.

There appears in the suggested budget an authorized item amounting to $2,690,000 for the Dallas Floodway. This project is approximately 30 percent completed, and the suggested amount should enable about two-thirds of the task to be performed by the end of the next fiscal year.

During these long years while the upper reaches have been brought under flood control, the treatment of the mid-Trinity tributaries has been delayed. Development has at last reached a stage at which we can now move into the middle one-third of the watershed and begin to share with its citizens the beneficial results of harnessing the floodwaters which have wrought such appreciable annual losses.

61653—55—pt. 2——34

Approval of the item of $50,000 requested for preliminary planning of the Navarro Mills Reservoir on Richland Creek will begin the necessary task bringing flood control on the central portion of the watershed. This new reservoir will serve the additional purpose of making possible the badly needed water storage capacity which can be built into the project at local expense.

I am convinced that the Navarro Mills Dam and Reservoir will serve an extremely important purpose and that it is urgently needed at the earliest possible moment.

Finally, I should like to stress that the proposed Lake Liberty, some 60 miles above the mouth of the river, is a key to continued progress in carrying out the Trinity master plan. It will be our last chance to put to major beneficial use the average 6 million acre-feet of water—almost 2 trillion gallons—which annually dump their precious cargo into the Gulf of Mexico.

None of these three projects specifically mentioned lies in my congressional district. Yet the future of the entire region is so inseparably linked with the future of the Trinity that I feel a sense of great interest in pursuing to an ultimate completion this worthwhile goal of Trinity River development.

I am certain that if you understand the importance of this program and the magnificent manner in which it has thus far progressed, you will agree that it richly deserves the continued support and cooperation of our Government.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Wright, we appreciate the testimony that you have given the committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of having been heard.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

LOS ANGELES HARBOR

WITNESS

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EVINS. We will hear from our colleague, Congressman McDonough, of California.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I do appreciate the opportunity of coming back to you after having been scheduled some time and it was found necessary to change the time. It is very considerate of you.

Before I get into this statement on the project that I came here particularly for, I just want to reiterate the testimony of the Los Angeles County flood-control engineer, Colonel Hedger, who appeared before your committee. I just want to endorse and recommend the statement he made and to call the committee's attention especially to two paragraphs in the statement.

I am speaking from years of experience in connection with my work as a Los Angeles County supervisor and as chairman of the Los Angeles Flood Control District for some time before I came to Congress.

I do not have to tell you of the tremendous increase in population that has taken place in California, but this is the pertinent thing that I want to say—the Los Angeles County Flood Control District is budgeting for the 1955–56 budget nearly $31 million of tax funds we raised by taxing our own people. This is close to double the amount that is recommended by the Federal Government for flood-control projects in the country.

In addition to these rather considerable sums, another $36 million will be spent by the district in the construction of storm drains, most of which are tributary to the federally constructed channels for flood control. Many of these storm drains cannot be built under the Federal projects, into which they discharge surface storm waters, are constructed. It should be noted the entire storm-drain construction program is being financed locally with funds from the $179 million bond issue, approved by the voters of Los Angeles County in 1952. These expenditures of large sums for flood control, approved by the people of this country, in direct bond elections and by their representatives and local governments, are clear testimony to the need that is felt here for providing this kind of protection and to the willingness on the part of the citizens of Los Angeles County to help themselves.

In other words, we are not coming to you and asking you to finance the whole of the project, or half of the project. We are asking you to finance a portion of the amount of money that we are spending out of our own tax money to maintain flood-control channels in Los Angeles County.

The project that I came to you this afternoon about is one that is very vital to the city of Los Angeles.

During the 83d Congress $896,500 was authorized for the improvement of Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor. Public Law 780 provided:

> Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California: House Document Numbered 161, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of $896,500: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon this project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the project hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such payments shall not exceed the sum of $500,000.

This committee now has under consideration an appropriation to reimburse the city of Los Angeles at this time in part for harbor improvements that have already been made at Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor.

The city of Los Anegeles has already spent $500,000 on this harbor-improvement project which was approved by the United States Army engineers with an estimated total cost of $896,500. Last year reimbursement to the city of Los Angeles was approved in the Rivers and Harbors omnibus bill, 83d Congress, which authorized reimbursement of the full cost of the project, $896,500.

The harbor improvement includes dredging of the east basin to provide a turning basin for deep-draft vessels. This improvement is needed immediately to serve the new harbor terminal which was constructed at a cost of nearly $8 million and is useless without an adequate turning basin as it is designed to serve deep-draft vessels

engaged in passenger and cargo service to Hawaii and other world points, and will generally handle world commerce in United States-flag vessels.

The narrow channel in front of the terminal heretofore dredged at Federal expense was of insufficient width—200 feet—to permit maneuvering of the class and size vessels requiring the use of the new terminal, and consequently it could be of little value until the dredging project was accomplished.

Because the dredging project was recommended by the Department of the Army and approved by the Army engineers, the work would doubtless eventually have been undertaken and completed at Government expense.

However, with the work on the new harbor terminal nearing completion, an emergency existed, and it was necessary for the Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners to proceed with the dredging immediately so that the terminal could be put into service as soon as possible following its completion.

As previously stated, of the total project cost of $896,500, all of which was approved by the 83d Congress for reimbursement to the city of Los Angeles, the city has already spent $500,000 which has provided a partially adequate turning basin to serve the new terminal.

The new harbor terminal is one of the most efficient and one of the largest of its kind ever constructed, and it would be of inestimable value from a national-defense standpoint in time of war as a point of embarkation for military personnel, heavy equipment, and so forth. It is strategically situated for such military use from the standpoint of accessibility to rail and truck transportation and is in a protected location in the inner harbor.

There is no question as to the importance of the dredging project in the east basin of Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, and in view of the urgent need for additional channel clearance to provide the necessary turning basin for vessels using the new terminal, it is obvious that improvement of the harbor could not be postponed and, therefore, it was undertaken by the city of Los Angeles.

However, this substantial investment by local interests was made in reliance upon the fact that since rivers and harbors improvements are functions of the Federal Government under the Rivers and Harbors Act, and have been universally undertaken by the Federal Government at Federal expense throughout the country for many years, this practice would be followed and the city of Los Angeles duly reimbursed for this expenditure.

I fully realize the demands made upon this committee for appropriation for important and necessary projects in all parts of the United States. But I do believe that the request now being made for only a partial reimbursement of the amount already authorized to the city of Los Angeles for the harbor improvement already made is a just and reasonable request.

The city of Los Angeles is subject to heavy demands at all times for certain maintenance of Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, and with other heavy city governmental expenses it needs some reimbursement for this expenditure which normally would have been made by the Federal Government.

The amount requested at this time is $250,000, just one-half of the amount expended to date by the city of Los Angeles for this project.

and less than one-third of the total authorization for the project, $896,500.

I sincerely urge, in consideration of these facts, that this committee grant the request for reimbursement of $250,000 to the city of Los Angeles for improvements already made at Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. McDonough, you are always very persuasive and convincing.

(The following additional information was furnished for the record:)

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY OF HON. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH

The authority for the reimbursement to the city of Los Angeles for out-of-pocket funds already spent by the city of Los Angeles for the improvement of the east basin of Los Angeles Harbor, I call the committee's attention to pages 4 and 5 of Public Law 780, 83d Congress, 2d session, which reads as follows in the paragraph titled "California":

"Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California: House Document Numbered 161, Eighty-third Congress, at an estimated cost of $896,500: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work as they may have done upon this project prior to July 1, 1953, at actual cost to local interests insofar as the same shall be approved by the Chief of Engineers and found to have been done in accordance with the project hereby adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for harbor improvement: *And provided further*, That such payments shall not exceed the sum of $500,000."

Although this authorization provides for reimbusement up to $500,000, I am requesting at this time that your committee appropriate only half of this amount, or $250,000. I make this request with the hope that the balance of the $500,000 may be appropriaetd in the next budget, and that we will very soon receive the full appropriation of $896,500 so that the dredging of the east basin may be completed at an early date in the future.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. McDonough.

WHITLOW RANCH RESERVOIR

WITNESSES

HON. JOHN J. RHODES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA
HON. STEWART L. UDALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA
OAKLEY JORDON, MANAGER, ROOSEVELT WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
COL. GEORGE BROWN, COMMANDING OFFICER, WILLIAMS AIR FORCE BASE
JERRY SKOUSEN, CHAIRMAN, QUEEN CREEK COMMITTEE
WALTER MERRILL, PRESIDENT, ROOSEVELT WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT
EARL RECKER
PETE A. NAVARRETE

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear next Congressman Rhodes and those he wishes to present to the committee.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you.

The project I would like to call to your attention is the Whitlow Ranch Reservoir.

I would like to call to the attention of the committee the brochure which was prepared by the Whitlow Ranch Dam Flood Control Committee.

Queen Creek is a stream which 364 days out of the year is as dry as can be but on the 365th day there is a torrent that does considerable damage to cultivated lands, urban property, utilities, and so on, and endangers the United States Air Force Base at Williams Field.

With that brief summary I would like to introduce my colleague, Congressman Udall, who has another engagement, and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Udall, the committee will be pleased to hear from you.

Mr. UDALL. I just want to say a word or two. This project, although it is located out of my district, most of the water that does the damage comes from my district so I feel a responsibility.

This is an important project because it not only does damage to a very rich farming area, but there is no military installation we have in the State that is more vital and more established than Williams Air Force Base, and I think that of all the projects we have pending of this nature, this certainly deserves a very high priority, and if sufficient money can be appropriated to get the show on the road with this project it would be greatly appreciated by the people of our State, and I hope you can see fit to get it started, at least.

Mr. EVINS. Will one of you gentlemen tell the committee how much funds you think could justifiably be used during the next fiscal year?

Mr. RHODES. The proper amount would be $100,000 for planning purposes. We are told by the Corps of Engineers that that amount could be spent in the next fiscal year.

Mr. EVINS. There has been no planning so far and no approval by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. RHODES. There has been no planning, and I understand the Bureau of the Budget has not approved an amount for this specific purpose. The reason this is brought up at this particular time is that in August 1954 there was a very disastrous flood which damaged the area to the extent of $2,100,000, which is almost half the total cost of the project when it is completed. So it is an emergency situation. We have the commanding officer of the Williams Air Force Base here to testify and I have talked to the authorities in the Pentagon and I am led to believe that this would meet with their approval although they have not yet been in a position to request it.

Mr. EVINS. Do you have other witnesses, Mr. Rhodes?

Mr. RHODES. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce at this time Senator Barry Goldwater.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be pleased to hear from you, Senator.

Senator GOLDWATER. I am very grateful for this opportunity to be here with you this afternoon. I just want to briefly give you my views as to the necessity for this construction.

I was born in Arizona and have lived in this general area all my life, and as long as I can remember the floods in the Queen Creek Basin have been a problem. They have not been as big a problem in

the past as in the last 10 or 15 years because this area has only been fully developed in the last 15 or 20 years. Prior to that time Queen Creek had a channel that was more to the south but, as is customary in the area, this channel has gradually moved 4 or 5 miles north of the old channel and when it floods it seriously threatens Williams Air Force Base.

I might mention the amount of silt this stream could carry compared to the Colorado River. The Colorado River has an average flow of 16,000 to 20,000 second-feet. This stream can reach 70,000 second-feet but averages 40,000. It carries past Bright Angel checking point a quantity of silt equivalent to 70 boxcars every 24 hours.

By the construction of this dam we can retain these vast flood waters, even though they come only occasionally, and recharge the ground water system which is diminishing at an alarming rate.

By the construction of this dam we can also accomplish soil conservation and silt control.

The protection of the tax base is important, and the general welfare over an immediate area of 84,000 acres, some 60,000 acres of which are highly developed and lie in the districts represented by the gentlemen who will appear later.

With the hazard removed by Whitlow Dam, development can be resumed in the area and new taxable wealth created.

One of the most important things, to my mind, after we leave the area of agriculture, which entails the living of these people in our part of the State, is the protection of Williams Air Force Base. The stream bed is so shifted that the water approaches Williams, and the commanding officer will tell you the danger they are in. When we are talking about losing an airplane we are talking about losing $1 million or $1.5 million, and this base will be one of the main crew-training bases. I do not know how many hundreds of millions of dollars in equipment it represents now, but it is fantastic. We had a similar situation at Luke Field, west of Phoenix, where, when it was built we thought it was safe, but because of the development of the lands to the north and west, that field received in 1950 a devastating flood that did several million dollars of damage to the field and equipment. Subsequently Congress authorized protective work to the north and west, and in keeping with that I think we should provide funds for this protective work.

The other witnesses are far more capable than I am to go into the details of this thing, but I did want to come as a native of that region and ask you to consider this project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Senator Goldwater.

Mr. HAND. Prior to the flood of 1954 to which our colleague, Mr. Rhodes, has referred, when was there another flood of consequence?

Senator GOLDWATER. I think I am correct in saying that in 39 years there have been 49 floods. Mr. Jordan will supply you with the accurate information, but there were floods in 1928, 1933, 1936, 1942, a big one in 1950, 1951, and 1954.

It does not take a lot of water to fall in this rather compact area to cause a flood. As you see on the map, it is a small drainage area but very deep.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to ask one question. In this watershed that drains into the river where you want to build this dam there are many ranches.

Mr. RHODES. There is very little grazing. It is mostly general agricultural land.

Mr. JENSEN. Soil conservation is flood protection in effect.

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It is not flood prevention but it keeps the water where it falls and keeps the valuable topsoil where it is if proper soil conservation measures are effected. Now, are the farmers in that watershed practicing soil conservation?

Senator GOLDWATER. Yes. In fact I think I am correct in saying the pioneer work in soil conservation was in the southeast corner of Salt River Valley. They have been pioneers in soil conservation in order to protect themselves. The basin itself has some grazing in it. It is very rocky, mountainous country. Out of this comparatively small bowl, which I would guess would be maybe 40 miles long and 30 miles across, comes this little stream we call Queen Creek. It is not very long from its source to the valley floor, maybe 20 miles, and it is perfectly dry most of the year but when the cloudbursts come and hit that mountain the water pours out on that flat valley floor and brings this silt and debris.

Mr. JENSEN. Is any effort being made to promote more vegetation on the mountains you speak of?

Senator GOLDWATER. All that will grow on this mountain are cacti and some small grass. There are no trees, as such, within this small basin, so you cannot do anything to create better conservation practices in the bowl. It is just rock and cacti.

Mr. JENSEN. In this project is it proposed to build smaller dams closer to the mountains on the tributaries?

Senator GOLDWATER. I believe that can best be answered by the gentleman who will follow me. I only know of this big dam. I do not know if they plan to build smaller dams or not.

Mr. JENSEN. The reason I ask that question is that the quicker you catch water coming from the mountains the less hazardous your flood is, because the slope up the stream and the rapidity of a stream of that nature does a terrific amount of damage and carries the silt along the stream. Of course the Army engineers understand that problem very well, but where it is possible to hold the water where it falls I, like almost everybody else, am a strong advocate of that type of flood prevention, and I hope that we do not build this dam until the people in the area have done everything within their power to hold as much of the water, the raindrops, where they fall and keep the rich topsoil where it belongs instead of letting it flow into the stream where it is a detriment. I have said on many occasions that I was not going to be very anxious to appropriate an awful lot of millions and billions to build great flood control dams if the people in the watershed were not concerned enough to hold their rich top soil where it belongs and out of the streams where it does great damage. So I hope that in this instance, as in all projects of this nature, we try to stop the water and the silt as much as we can before it gets into the stream and goes rushing to the sea.

Senator GOLDWATER. I might say in that connection that that basin is a very small area. I would compare it to a bathtub. There is no topsoil, as such, that can be washed away. It is hard rock.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Jensen, if I might interpose, there is one man in the State who knows the answer to your question, and that is Mr. Jordan, the manager of the Roosevelt Water Conservation District.

Mr. JORDAN. To answer your question, an effort is being made to work with the Soil Conservation Service for this project. The Soil Conservation Service has told us they would not approve any project of that type until the waters of Queen Creek were controlled, because any small dams put into the foothills area where most of the erosion occurs would be destroyed by these terrific waters that come in from the steeper elevations. So they have discouraged us from doing anything except getting ready. They have a plan which will entail $1,700,000, of which the participants would have to put up at least half the money. Thirty-eight percent of the land in this area is federally owned. Twenty-eight percent is owned by the State of Arizona, and the rest is privately owned. The elevation goes from 2,000 to 7,000 feet in a 10-mile span and that is where 80 percent of our water is dropped.

Last August 19 we had from 3 to 5 inches of rainfall in 3 hours on this high watershed and we had 30,000 second-feet of water come down upon us, and, as you know, in the desert country the cooler atmosphere starts the water first. So this terrific amount of water conjuncted with the rainfall and there was no place to put the water because the torrents from the hills had taken place.

This project was authorized in 1946 by the Army engineers but no appropriations have been made because of policy. The Korean conflict and one thing and another have prevented civil projects and a request has never been made because of that policy until this time.

Mr. JENSEN. How much, if any, valuable agricultural land will be inundated because of the building of this dam?

Mr. JORDAN. None. The dam is in a national forest.

Mr. RHODES. I think it would be well if Mr. Jordan would explain the last flood. There were 2, 1 on August 19 and 1 on August 21, and the difference is very significant as it affects Williams Air Force Base.

Mr. JORDAN. The area in blue [indicating on map] is 35,000 acres of irrigated, cultivated land. The yellow portion is where the channel filled from the railroad east. That channel was normally 12 to 15 feet deep and at the end of the 19th it was only about 6 inches deep. It had been completely filled for several miles. About 1 inch in 4 hours came in on the 21st, much smaller in proportion. That silt went into and around Williams Field. If the canal banks had not ruptured Williams Field would have been seriously damaged from this water because the water was up to the edge of the Wherry housing when the canal banks ruptured. Another flood would certainly do millions of dollars of damage to Williams Field if it should occur before anything was done.

The farmers themselves have put their tractors and bulldozers out there and tried to clean the channel, but it is not that kind of a job.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you.

Mr. RHODES. I would like to introduce Col. George Brown, commanding officer of the Williams Air Force Base, who will be our last witness.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will be glad to hear you, Colonel Brown.

Mr. HAND. Might I ask one question before Colonel Brown gets into his testimony? Who estimated this amount of damage of $2,100,000?

Mr. JORDAN. The Army engineers set a task crew into the area after the flood of August 19.

Mr. HAND. That estimate was made by the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. JORDAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAND. Thank you.

Colonel BROWN. I am Col. George Brown, commanding officer of the Air Force base at Williams Field. I am here at the request of Mr. Rhodes and with the permission of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force. I have no prepared statement.

Mr. EVINS. Tell us briefly about the floods which occurred there recently.

Colonel BROWN. The two floods of record that have damaged Williams Air Force Base, one was in 1951, and that resulted in damage to our dike; and in 1954, last summer, in the flood of August 19 and 21, water did enter the base and we had to suspend operations. It left sufficient debris that we had to abandon it a few days until we could clean it. It did not damage it.

Water rose to the boundary road of the Wherry housing which is on the base proper. Had not the canal to the west of us ruptured and relieved the water pressure, I am convinced we would have had water in the windows of every structure on the base.

The Air Force supports, but has not felt it necessary to sponsor, legislation that would fund the construction of this dam in the Whitlow Ranch area.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Colonel.

Mr. RHODES. Before we go I would like to introduce Mr. Jerry Skousen, chairman of the Queen Creek Committee; Mr. Earl Recker, a rancher; and Mr. Walter Merrill, president of the Roosevelt Water Conservation District.

I want to thank the committee for the time you have given us. I tried to point out that there is some emergency involved and, as you know, sometimes it takes time to evaluate a flood. If we had been able to evaluate it and present the facts and figures sooner, I feel it would have been in the budget this year. I am appearing on the basis of an emergency, that there is an emergency involved, and I hope we can get this started a year sooner.

Mr. EVINS. You made a very comprehensive statement.

(The following material was submitted by the Whitlow Ranch Dam Flood Control Committee:)

REPORT OF WHITLOW RANCH DAM FLOOD CONTROL COMMITTEE

1. Name of project

Whitlow Ranch Reservoir.

2. Location

(*a*) Arizona

(*b*) First Congressional District. Second Congressional District.

(*c*) South Pacific Division, Los Angeles District Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

3. General nature and purpose

This is primarily a flood-control project. The stream upon which the improvement is proposed is nonnavigable. Floods in the Queen Creek basin, Ariz., cause

direct and indirect damage to cultivated lands, irrigation works, urban property, highways, railroads and other utilities including an important United States Air Force installation at Williams Field, and constitute a menace to the lives and health of the residents.

The plan provides for the construction of a dam and basin for flood control. The dam would be of concrete, gravity type, with a maximum height of 130 feet above stream bed, and a crest length of 535 feet. An uncontrolled spillway 200 feet in length and outlet works would be an integral part of the dam. The reservoir would have a total capacity at spillway crest of 24,000 acre-feet, of which 17,000 acre-feet would be reserved for flood control, and 7,000 acre-feet for sedimentation and conservation purposes.

The operation of the reservoir would regulate the runoff from 143 square miles, reducing the maximum flow from 59,000 to 1,400 cubic feet per second. The project would provide flood protection to an area of 84,000 acres, of which 59,000 acres are highly developed irrigated lands in Queen Creek irrigation district, the Roosevelt water conservation district, the Salt River project, and the San Carlos project.

The reservoir would be operated solely for flood control. Retardation of flood flows, however, would permit the percolation of all runoff from most floods into the underground storage basins along the channel.

4. Legislative status

Authority from State legislature has been obtained. (Sec. 75–2039 and 75-2310, Arizona Code, 1939). Survey authorized by United States Congress (Public Law 738, 74th Cong., H. R. 8455) approved June 22, 1936, and the act (Public Law 761, 75th Cong., H. R. 10618) approved June 28, 1938. This project was authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946. It is believed that all legislative requirements have been complied with. Initiation of construction awaits only an appropriation by Congress.

5. Physical status

The project has been surveyed and transmitted by the Secretary of War, (H. Doc. 220, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), referred to Committee on Public Works. No construction work has been done. Project is inactive, awaiting appropriation of funds.

6. Departmental status

Project has been submitted by the War Department to Congress, and received congressional authorization, and now awaits appropriation.

7. Estimated annual economic benefits

Value of the average annual benefits estimated to accure from the construction of a dam and basin for flood control at Whitlow Ranch site on Queen Creek amounts to $226,000,[1] based on 1952 price levels, compiled by the Army engineers for this project.

8. Estimated annual revenue

This project is not revenue producing.

9. Other credits to the project

Other credits accruing to this project in addition to the tangible benefits reported in item 7 are intangible benefits which are considerable but not susceptible of monetary evaluation.

(*a*) Water released from the flood-control basin at reduced rate and extended over longer period would, in large measure, recharge groundwater and thus materially increase usable water supplies.

(*b*) Soil conservation and silt control will result. These will accrue without any additional cost to the United States.

(*c*) The protection of the tax base and the general welfare over an immediate area of 84,000 acres, some 60,000 acres of which are highly developed.

(*d*) The protection of Williams Field Air Force Base and a substantial part of the Government's liability to other property caused by the necessity of constructing separate protecting works for the airbase.

(*e*) Investments and improvements within the area liable to floods are now almost at a standstill. With the hazard removed by Whitlow Dam, develop-

[1] This figure represents annual benefits estimated by Army at 1939 price levels ($96,000) converted to June 1952 prive levels, using factor of 2.766.

ment can still be resumed and new taxable wealth created. The annual benefits will then be correspondingly more than the $266,000 now estimated.

10. Estimated cost

Cost is estimated at $4,550,000. Note.—Army estimate in House Document No. 220, $1,645,000, based on 1939 price levels. Army now estimates cost at $4,550,000 as at June 1952. (See Report on Water Resources Development by the Corps of Engineers in Arizona, dated January 1, 1953.)

11. Estimated annual operating and maintenance expense

Expense estimated at $21,575. Note.—Army estimates of $7,800 increased by application of factor of 2.766.

12. Length of time estimated to complete

Two years, not more than 3 years (Army engineers).

13. Objectors

Hearings and publicity on this project have developed no single objection.

14. Proponents

Queen Creek Irrigation District, Queen Creek, Ariz.; Roosevelt Water Conservation District, Higley, Ariz.; Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix, Ariz.; Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, Phoenix, Ariz.; Mesa Chamber of Commerce, Mesa, Ariz.; Gilbert Chamber of Commerce, Gilbert, Ariz.; Chandler Chamber of Commerce, Chandler, Ariz.; Sacaton Indian Tribunal Council, Sacaton, Ariz.; Maricopa Farm Bureau, Phoenix, Ariz.; Mesa Farm Bureau, Mesa, Ariz.; Chandler Farm Bureau, Chandler, Ariz.; Queen Creek Farm Bureau, Queen Creek, Ariz.

15. Sponsors

Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, County Courthouse, Phoenix, Ariz.; Queen Creek Irrigation District, Queen Creek, Ariz.; Roosevelt Water Conservation District, Higley, Ariz.; Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix, Ariz.; Pinal County Board of Supervisors, Florence, Ariz.

REPORT ON FLOOD OF AUGUST 19, 1954, QUEEN CREEK AND VICINITY, ARIZONA, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER, LOS ANGELES DISTRICT, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 24, 1954

AUTHORITY

1. This report is submitted pursuant to instructions in subparagraphs 4223.05 b and d, chapter IV, Operations, Part II, Civil Works, Orders and Regulations, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

GENERAL

2. This report describes the storm, flood, and flood damages that occurred August 19, 1954, in the Queen Creek Basin and the Superstition Mountain area. Also included is a description of the relatively minor storm and flood of August 20, 1954, in the same general area. Queen Creek is a tributary of the Gila River.

DESCRIPTION

3. *Location and extent.*—The Queen Creek drainage and the Superstition Mountain area lie east of the confluence of the Salt and Gila Rivers and extend roughly from Superior, Ariz., to Chandler, Ariz. The combined area of the drainages is approximately 880 square miles including irrigated agricultural lands in the lower portion of the basins.

4. Queen Creek Basin is composed of a drainage area of about 426 square miles. The basin is bounded on the east by the Pinal Mountains. On the south, a poorly defined ridge in the area due east of Santan Mountain separates the Queen Creek drainage area from that of the Gila River. Adjacent to and north and west of the basin is what is known locally as the Superstition Mountain area. The Superstition Mountain area, which is composed of a series of independent washes, is bounded on the north by the Superstition Mountains. These drainages are independent of each other in the mountains and foothills, but during

periods of high runoff some of the flows intermingle on the desert plain in the vicinity of the Roosevelt Water Conservation District canal.

5. *Economy.*—The area of principal flood damage consists of irrigated farmland in and adjacent to the Queen Creek Irrigation District, Roosevelt Water Conservation District, and the Salt River project. Cotton is the leading crop in this area. Next in importance are alfalfa and feed grains. The towns of Gilbert, Higley, and Queen Creek, and Williams Air Force Base are located in the area.

STORM AND FLOOD

6. The headwaters of Queen Creek originate in the Pinal Mountains at elevations varying from 4,000 to about 5,500 feet. The elevation of the streambed at the Whitlow Ranch dam site is about 2,050 feet. Several of the headwater streams have gradients in excess of 1,000 feet per mile. Streambeds throughout the foothills and plains generally have streambed gradients less than 100 feet per mile. The heavy rains of the storm of August 19, 1954, centered over the mountains and foothills and covered the upper Queen Creek drainage area. Heavy rains were reported in the Superstition Mountain area. Very light sprinkles to zero precipitation were reported in the plains area west and south of the Superstition and Pinal Mountains. On August 20, 1954, moderate amounts of rain were reported in the vicinity of Apache Junction in the Superstition Mountain area and at Granite Reef Dam and Mormon Flat in the Salt River area, which is adjacent to and northwest of the Superstition Mountains.

7. *Rainfall.*—Rain began about 1 a. m. on the 19th of August and continued until 8 or 9 a. m. An intensity of 2.01 inches per hour was reported at Ray (station 15, appendixes 1 and 2). Another intensity reported at Florence Junction, was 1.75 inches per hour. By applying a correction to the hourly amounts of the tipping-bucket gage located at Superior, an hourly intensity of 1.13 inches was estimated. Intensities at other stations ranged from ½ to ¾ inch per hour. Another storm, more local in character and with lower precipitation intensities, began about 2 a. m. on the 20th and continued until 5 a. m. Time between the 2 storms ranged from 13 to 20 hours. The Queen Creek recorder at Whitlow Ranch dam site did not record properly for these storms. Table 1 shows pertinent data for 18 precipitation stations. Appendixes 1 and 2 show location of stations and isohyets for the storms of the 19th and 20th, respectively.

TABLE 1.—*Pertinent data, storms of Aug. 19 and 20, 1954, Queen Creek and vicinity, Arizona*

Number	Precipitation station name and location	Precipitation		Duration	Reliability of record	Remarks
		Date	Amount			
			Inches	*Hours*		
1	Mesa Experiment Farm, west of Mesa.	19	0.02	2	Excellent.	Light rain from 8 to 10 a. m.
		20	0	(1)		
2	Falcon Field 1¼ miles southwest.	19	.46	2	...do....	Located at Mr. Armstead's citrus grove.
		20	0	(1)		
3	Granite Reef Dam, at dam....	19	0	(1)	...do....	Data obtained from U. S. Weather Bureau at Phoenix.
		20	1.35	(2)		
4	Stewart Mountain, at dam....	19	0	(1)	...do....	Do.
		20	.41	(2)		
5	Mormon Flat, at dam.....	19	0	(1)	...do....	Do.
		20	1.55	(2)		
6	Charles Weeks Ranch, 4 miles east of Apache Junction.	19	4.5	6	Good...	Heavy rains, 16½ hours between storms.
		20	1.5	4		
7	King's Ranch, 7 miles east and south of Apache Junction.	19	4.93	7	Excellent.	2 storms 13 hours apart.
		20	.17	4		
8	Barkley Ranch No. 1, 10 miles east of Apache Junction.	19	3.5	6½	Good...	2 storms 19 hours apart.
		20	2.6	2		
9	Barkley Ranch No. 2, 12 miles east of Apache Junction.	19	4.5	6	...do....	2 storms 20 hours apart.
		20	.4	2		
10	Florence Junction, at junction of highways 60, 70, 80, and 89.	19	4.25	6	Excellent.	Heavy rains, from 3 to 7 a. m.: =2.50 in.; from 8 to 9 a. m.= 1.75 in.
		20	0	(1)		
11	Boyce Thompson Arboretum..	19	5.30	6½	Good....	Very heavy rain from 5 to 8 a. m. of the 19th.
		20	.07	(3)		
12	Superior Smelter, southwest end of town.	19	2.68	4½	Excellent.	A tipping-bucket recorder at same location registered 0.95 inch of rain.
		20	0	(1)		
13	Superior Smelter office, east end of town.	19	2.47	4¼	...do.....	
		20	0	(1)		
14	Pinal Ranch, approximately 6 miles east of Superior on Highways 60-70.	19	1.64	4½	...do.....	2 storms 16½ hours apart.
		20	1.00	2		
15	Ray, at smelter office.....	19	4.05	2	Good....	2 storms 14 hours apart.
		20	.42	(3)		
16	Florence, southwest side of town.	19	.01	(4)	Excellent.	
		20	0	(1)		
17	Queen Creek, town of Queen Creek.	19	0	(1)	----------	No record. Several residents claim there was no rain.
		20	0	(1)		
18	Williams Air Force Base, at headquarters on base.	19	.62	7	Excellent.	Observations made every 6 hours.
		20	(4)	(3)		

[1] Not applicable.
[2] No data available.
[3] During night.
[4] Trace.

8. *Runoff.*—The United States Geological Survey estimated a peak of 40,000 cubic feet per second at 10 a. m. on the 19th on Queen Creek at Whitlow Ranch dam site (drainage area 143 square miles). This was much greater than the previous maximum peak of record (13,200 cubic feet per second). At 9:05 a. m. a peak of 27,500 cubic feet per second was recorded at this site and at 9:45 a. m. the recording-gage station was washed out and was not recovered until a few days later. In the areas of greatest damage (Queen Creek Irrigation District, Williams Air Force Base, and Roosevelt Water Conservation District), the flood peak came at approxmately 2 p. m. on the 19th. The flood peak continued through the irrigated area reaching the town of Gilbert between midnight and 2 a. m. on the 20th. The residents of Apache Junction reported 2 flood peaks, 1 between 7 and 10 a. m. on the 19th and a second, a larger peak, about 6 or 7 a. m. on the 20th. Apache Junction was the only place that reported damaging flood flow from the storm of the 20th. All floodwaters had subsided by the afternoon of the 20th.

9. *Overflow area.*—The runoff came down the washes from the Pinal and Superstition Mountains, crossed the desert as sheet flow and spread out over the irrigated farmland. The damaging flows from Queen Creek covered approximately 17,000 acres of farmland, from Williams Air Force Base on the north to Chandler Heights Irrigation District on the south, and from the Maricopa-Pinal County line on the east to the Roosevelt Water Conservation District Canal on the west. The runoff from the Superstition Mountain area flooded irrigated agricultural land adjacent to and east of the Roosevelt Water Conservation District's dike and canal, overtopped and broke through the dike in many places, and flooded

farmland from the dike to the town of Gilbert on the west. The damaging overflow inundated approximately 13,000 acres and extended from Williams Air Force Base and the Southern Pacific Railroad on the south to the vicinity of Gila and Salt River baseline on the north. The total farmland flooded by flow from both drainage areas was about 30,000 acres.

10. The source of damaging floodwaters was easily determined except for a few areas, such as Williams Air Force Base, where runoff from both the Queen Creek drainage area and the Superstition Mountain area appeared to join and cause overflow and damage. The overflow areas of principal damage are outlined on the attached map, appendix 3. This map indicates the extent of the flood in Maricopa County where most of the damaged farmland is located. Within the outline there are areas, such as Williams Air Force Base, which were not completely inundated. To the north and east of the area shown on this map, the floodwaters were poorly defined, coming across the desert as sheet flow with occasional islands of dry land. To the south and east of the area shown on this map, severe damage from the flood occurred on a considerable acreage of cultivated farmland along Queen Creek in Pinal County.

FLOOD DAMAGE ESTIMATES

11. *Fieldwork.*—Los Angeles District personnel arrived in the flooded area on Wednesday, August 25, 1954, to investigate and gather data on rainfall, runoff, and resultant flood damage. The overflow area was determined, and owners and operators of farms were interviewed. District personnel were assisted in this work by the United States Soil Conservation Service officials in the area. Damage reports were obtained from officials of the State of Arizona, Maricopa County, Pinal County, the town of Gilbert, and local irrigation districts. Owners of damaged business and residential property were interviewed. The field survey extended from August 25 through August 30, 1954.

12. *General nature of flood damage.*—All types of property were damaged by the floodwaters. As this area is principally agricultural the highest monetary damage was to crops and irrigation facilities. Crops were completely ruined in some areas, being flattened on the ground and covered with debris. A large portion of the cotton was partially damaged as water reached the lower bolls, causing a lowering of the quality and increased harvesting costs. There was also considerable erosion, especially in fallow fields. Concrete irrigation ditches were torn out and scattered across the fields. Dikes and major irrigation canals were overtopped and breached. Residences and businesses were damaged by water and mud in the rural areas and in the towns of Apache Junction, Gilbert, and Queen Creek.

13. Roads and highways suffered heavy damage in Pinal and Maricopa Counties as floodwaters concentrated in the roads and caused considerable erosion. Major damage to public facilities was at Williams Air Force Base where a dike was overtopped and mud and debris were deposited on parts of the field. An auxiliary field was covered with mud and debris. Comparatively minor damages to railroads and utilities were noted.

14. *Emergency work.*—Several hundred men were at work for several hours in an attempt to protect dikes and irrigation works. Residents and businessmen in Gilbert were able to prevent considerable damage by sandbagging and moving damageable goods prior to inundation.

15. *Estimates of flood damages.*—Detailed estimates of damage were made on the basis of information gathered in the field. The total estimated damages amounted to $2,100,000. A summary of the estimated damages resulting from the flood of August 19, 1954 in Queen Creek and vicinity, Arizona, is given in table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated damages, flood of Aug. 19, 1954, Queen Creek and vicinity, Arizona*

Type of property	Damages		
	Direct	Indirect	Total
Residential	$25,000	$2,000	$27,000
Business and industrial	90,000	15,000	105,000
Public	7,700	200	7,900
Agricultural	1,400,000	210,000	1,610,000
Irrigation works	53,500	2,000	55,500
Highways and roads	265,000	1,600	266,600
Railroads	3,000	3,000	6,000
Utilities	1,500	200	1,700
Total	1,845,700	234,000	2,079,700
Say			2,100,000

16. *Photographs.*—Photographs of damaged property were taken by local photographers and by the district office representatives. Photographs selected to show the nature, extent, and severity of the flood damages are included in appendix 4 of this report.

LOSS OF LIFE

17. No loss of life occurred. Depths were not excessive in most areas and fortunately no one was caught in the washes or low spots.

DAMAGES PREVENTABLE BY AUTHORIZED CORPS OF ENGINEERS IMPROVEMENTS

18. *Whitlow Ranch Reservoir.*—The project for the Whitlow Ranch Reservoir was authorized by Congress in the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946. The recommended plan provides for a dam on Queen Creek at the Whitlow Ranch site, located 5.2 miles above the U. S. 60–70 highway bridge near Florence Junction and 2.3 miles above the mouth of Whitlow Canyon. This dam would reduce the reservoir design peak flow of 59,000 cubic feet per second to an outflow peak of 1,400 cubic feet per second. Since this dam site is above the mouth of Whitlow Canyon, floods from this canyon would not be controlled.

19. *Preventable damages.*—Most of the damages were easily separable into those caused by flows from Queen Creek and those caused by runoff from the Superstition Mountain area. However, in a few areas damages were caused by a combination of Queen Creek floodwater and floodwater from other washes. In these areas, an arbitrary division of damages was made. The estimated damages from Queen Creek floodwaters below Whitlow Ranch Dam site are $1,200,000. Flow from Whitlow Canyon would not be controlled and therefore it is probable that there would have been some damage even with a dam at Whitlow Ranch sit. It is estimated that at least $1 million in damages would have been prevented had this dam been built.

WACO, TEX.

WITNESSES

HON. W. R. POAGE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

HON. O. B. ROBERTSON, MAYOR, WACO, TEX.

BASSETT WATSON, PAST PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, WACO, TEX.

JACK KULTGEN, WACO, TEX.

SIDNEY DOBBINS, MANAGER, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, WACO, TEX.

HARLON FENTRESS, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, WACO, TEX., AND PUBLISHER OF NEWSPAPERS IN WACO, AUSTIN, AND PORT ARTHUR, TEX.

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear Congressman Poage of Texas and those whom he may present.

I wish to state at the outset that Congressman Poage has been most diligent and he has spoken to me and I know to other members of the committee about the project he is interested in.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think I might introduce the representatives from Waco. We will start with Mayor O. B. Robertson of Waco; Mr. Bassett Watson, past president of the Chamber of Commerce of Waco; Mr. Jack Kultgen, member of the board of the Brazos River Authority of Waco; Mr. Sidney Dobbins, manager of the Chamber of Commerce of Waco; and Mr. Harlon Fentress, president of the Waco Chamber of Commerce and publisher of newspapers at Waco, Austin, and Port Arthur, Tex.

We are here in the interest of some planning money for what is known as the Waco Reservoir. For a great many years we have been working on the Brazos project. Nineteen years ago this spring the first resolution I got through Congress when I came here was one through the old Flood Control Committee to authorize the survey of the Brazos and it tributaries. That started the work 19 years ago. The engineers made various recommendations and two dams have been built, the Whitey Reservoir and the Belton Reservoir. Then there has been a reservoir built by the State with WPA assistance.

Those three reservoirs are, of course, key structures in the flood-control program, but obviously they cannot be expected to completely control the stream that is as long as the Tennessee River with almost as much population in its valley as the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. EVINS. I am glad to note the affectionate reference of the gentleman from Texas to the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. POAGE. We have to recognize that many of our great men come from Tennessee.

The fourth reservoir which has been recommended by the Army engineers and authorized by Congress is the one at Waco on the Bosque. The Bosque is the main tributary of the Brazos which has not as yet been dammed.

While we now have the Whitney Reservoir on the main stream of the Brazos above Waco, we do not have flood control in Waco until we can control the Bosque itself, because the Bosque can flood the city. So until we have control of this tributary, the Bosque, we will not have flood control for Waco and from Waco to the gulf.

We realize there have been people before you all day and all day yesterday and will be all day tomorrow, probably, pointing out the difficulties they are facing with regard to flood problems, and we know they face them, just as we do. We know those problems are not unique with us. But we feel we are not entirely in the same situation with all the projects you are going to hear in that our authorization contemplates, and we contemplate and we look forward to the opportunity to cooperate with the Federal Government in contributing at least some portion of the cost of this reservoir.

We are not telling you we are here to pay part of the cost of flood control, because nobody does and we do not feel Waco should, but we need city water. We find ourselves in a position where we have to have city water. If we can cooperate with the Federal Government we will work it that way, and we believe that will be to the advantage of both parties. If we cannot, we will have to raise money through the sale of bonds and build a separate water system. Of course we will not get as much by building our own water supply as we would

by putting the same amount of money in a large Federal dam, and the Federal Government will not get as much flood control benefits as it would if Waco joined in the construction.

The mayor of Waco is here and a representative of the Brazos River Authority, who will tell you they will buy any excess water so that the Federal Government will not have 100 percent expense at Waco as it often has at other places.

Everybody can tell you they need flood control, but at the same time the important thing we want to impress upon you is that Waco stands ready to pay a substantial portion of the cost.

Mr. EVINS. How many damaging floods have occurred at Waco in the past 5 or 10 years?

Mr. POAGE. None in the last 5 years because we have not had enough rain to wet a saddle in the last 5 years. Our trouble has been dry weather in the last 5 years. The last serious flood was in 1936. There was one in 1945, but the one in 1936 did many millions of dollars of damage. The engineers estimated that the damage runs $2.5 million a year, averages that, from floods on the Brazos below the mouth of the Bosque.

Now, of course, that means that in one of these great floods we will get $35 million to $40 million of damage. I know that the 1936 flood ran somewhere in the neighborhood of $40 million—I do not have the exact figures—but the damage was tremendous.

I may say that the Brazos River and its tributaries have carried more water than went by Kansas City in the flood of 1951. Some people questioned that but the Army engineers told us that 631,000 second-feet of water passed Cameron which is down below Waco, 631,000 second-feet of water, and that is more water than ever passed down the Mississippi River above Alton, Ill.

Mr. EVINS [interposing]. It is not only a flood damage proposition, but it is a problem of conserving the use of the water that could be put to advantageous use.

Mr. POAGE. This dam would not involve a great deal of conservation, except for the city of Waco and such other storage as the Engineers would feel was justified. The Brazos Authority stands ready to buy any conservation storage from the Government. This is a non-irrigating dam; it is primary flood control; it is not a power dam.

Mr. EVINS. How much money do you think should be put in the budget that could be justifiably and properly expended?

Mr. POAGE. $100,000. We are only asking to get the money that——

Mr. EVINS. You are asking for the budget figures?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, that is the recommendation, as I understand it.

Now, I would like to ask that you hear first from Mr. Fentress.

Mr. HAND. Other members of Congress have referred to the flood of 1936.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. HAND. If Whitney Dam had been built, would it have met that problem?

Mr. POAGE. No. That flood of 1936, originated at least 75 percent of it, below the present dam at Whitney. Maybe, I should say, that there is in Texas what is known as the Balcones fault, which comes across the State from the southwest, out about Del Rio, up by Austin, Waco, Dallas, and turns east.

It seems to have been the history that a great many times we get floods that originate right in this fault area, which is an area immediately west of Waco, immediately west of Temple and of Austin. We often have a rainfall of from 15 to 20 inches; that is not unusual in that area, although conversely, we may have long periods when there is no rainfall at all; but we have had several times when we have had more than 15 inches of rainfall within 2 or 3 days in that immediate area; it never seems to extend very far west; these heavy rainfalls never seem to extend more than 75 miles upstream from Waco.

Mr. HAND. I think I have the picture, thank you very much.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Fentress, the committee will be glad to hear you.

Mr. FENTRESS. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Poage has covered the general picture pretty well.

Back in 1930, when our present water supply facilities were considered adequate, but they have now formed, in fact, a mud pool in the lake—that is about what it is.

We had a population of somewhere in the neighborhood of 47,000 to 48,000; we now have a population of something in excess of 100,000. Our storage, that is, our water supply for the city, domestic supply, has dwindled by 60 percent because of excessive siltation.

The lake originally had 31,000 acre-feet which was adequate for 50,000 people. It now has less than 16,000 acre-feet of water.

And the average daily evaporation of water from that lake is very heavy; it goes down very rapidly, especially when we have not had rains, such as has been our experience for the past few years.

It is contemplated that the proposed reservoir, as recommended by the Corps of Engineers, would give us about 100,000—a little in excess of 100,000—acre-feet of water conservation, on top of which there will be 488,000 acre-feet of flood-control capacity.

As Mr. Poage has pointed out to you, the terrain down below Waco is such that no flood-control facility can be constructed. The area broadens out into a flat plain and there is no suitable location for them.

The Army engineers have chosen this site because it blocks the confluence of three rivers; the Bosque River, which he has pointed out to you, forms one of the greatest flood tributaries to the Brazos itself. This would impound water in these three separate watersheds. It would back up the reservoir that I spoke of in terms of some 600,000 acre-feet.

Now, of that, about 65,000 acre-feet is allowed for any possible further siltation, which is deplacable because the upstream soil conservation practices have been so improved in the last few years that siltation has become less each year.

I might refer you to House Document 535 in which the Soil Conservation Service estimates that the capacity of the existing reservoir would be depleted by 1955 or 1960. They did not miss their guess very much. This guess was made back in 1936 and is right down, now, as I say, to about 16,000 acre-feet of water. It is totally inadequate to supply a town better than 100,000 population.

Mr. EVINS. I think I can see your picture; your population is increasing and your water supply is decreasing.

Mr. FENTRESS. Not only that, but the per capita consumption has raised 7 percent.

Mr. EVINS. I might say that personally if a dam is built in that area, I can see no reason why a suitable arrangement could not be worked out with the Corps of Engineers for the city of Waco to buy water from the reservoir for whatever it might need.

Mr. FENTRESS. As the Congressman pointed out, we have got to have some water, Mr. Chairman, and we are going to have to build a reservoir if we cannot work out some sort of a cooperative program with the Federal Government.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call now upon the mayor of the city of Waco, Mr. O. B. Robertson.

Mr. EVINS. Mayor Robertson, you may make such statements as you wish.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is O. B. Robertson. I am mayor of the city of Waco. I am, and for 32 years have been engaged in the ice cream business in Waco.

As has been pointed out by Mr. Fentress, our two greatest needs in Waco are probably flood protection and an adequate water supply. Our city has developed rather rapidly for the past 20 years, but we cannot fail to recall the fact that we have experienced devastating floods in the past and until the flow of the Bosque River is controlled, we know that these floods may reoccur. The Army engineers have recommended a structure that will protect us from these floods. At the same time, Waco's domestic water supply is, as has been explained, reaching a critical point. We must have a new and greatly enlarged water supply. We recognize that the people of Waco must pay for this water supply. We do not expect the Federal Government to give it to us; however, we realize that if we can take care of our needs for municipal water at the same time that the engineers construct the needed flood-protection works, that there can be a saving for both the city and the Federal Government. We believe that this is good business. Waco is ready to vote the bonds necessary to provide for our municipal water supply.

If we are not given an opportunity to cooperate with the Federal Government, we will have to do this alone. Obviously, the city of Waco cannot contemplate building a structure anywhere in the neighborhood of the size contemplated by the flood-control program, but we would be glad to put our water-supply money into the same project with the Government's flood-control money and to build a structure that will serve both purposes at the same time. As mayor of the city of Waco, I am authorized to repeat the commitment heretofore made that if this flood-control project can be commenced in the near future that Waco will pay her fair share of the cost.

We are all united on this project, and there is no organized opposition at the local level.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Robertson.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Poage, what is the estimated total cost of this project?

Mr. POAGE. Approximately $38 million, I believe.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Approximately $38 million; yes.

Mr. JENSEN. And how much is chargeable to flood control and other activities of the project?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would have to get the engineers' information on that.

Mr. KULTGEN. To put it in reverse, Mr. Chairman, the city of Waco's share would be approximately 4 or 5 million dollars. It throws some light on what the Brazos River Authority is proposing to purchase from the Government, the balance of the conservation water which the city does not use. That figure we can determine now on one of the subjects that is now in negotiation with the Army engineers, and is determined largely by the cost of providing water.

Mr. JENSEN. What percentage of the total reimbursable feature does this $4 million—or whatever it is—that you expect the city of Waco to pay, represent?

Mr. KULTGEN. Congressman, I think 15 percent would be about as good a guess as anybody can make.

Mr. JENSEN. The $40 million is the total cost?

Mr. KULTGEN. About $38 million.

Mr. JENSEN. $38 million.

Mr. POAGE. Yes: that was the estimate.

Mr. FENTRESS. That is based on the 1950 estimate.

Mr. JENSEN. What I was trying to get at is this: What percentage of the reimbursable cost of this project does that $4 million-plus the city of Waco agrees to put into this project, represent?

Mr. POAGE. It is rather speculative. There are no reimbursable features in this specifically, except what the city of Waco will put into it, and what the Brazos Authority will pay for the water to be used for irrigation purposes, because there is no power in this project. It was established by the Army engineers purely as a flood-control project.

Mr. JENSEN. The clerk has just shown me some figures, which shows that it is all nonreimbursable except for water supply, part of which the city of Waco agrees to contribute to the cost of this project in order to get sufficient water supply.

Mr. POAGE. There will be some reimbursement. If you would like to have us, I think we can get that.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; from the river authority.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

And, I would like to ask Mr. Kultgen to comment on the point. He is a director of the Brazos Authority, which is a State agency.

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to hear you, Mr. Kultgen.

Mr. KULTGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am a businessman in Waco and a director of the Brazos River Authority. The Brazos River Authority is a State agency, appointed by the Governor, and charged with the responsibility of controlling, as well as it can, the entire Brazos River Valley in Texas.

The authority has built and operated one large dam, called the Morris Sheppard Dam, a power dam, and was financed out of power revenue. The authority has no other means of building dams, except through the sale of power. We have under engineering study now five more dams between Possum Kingdom and Whitney, a place above Waco, where power is possible, where we can get closure. Of course, those dams will be built through the sale of bonds, financed by revenue from the power.

We cooperate fully with the Army engineers and are at the moment negotiating with the Army for handling of the Whitney Dam and taking over the power of the Whitney Dam. We try to integrate and

operate all of these dams in order to get the maximum concentration and maximum beneficial use of the water.

At the present time, 85 percent of the water that flows down the Brazos goes on out into the gulf, simply because we do not have any place to put it.

We are also negotiating with the Army for the purpose of conservation storage at the Belton Dam, which was recently completed, and we are pretty close to closing the deal. It is simply a question of determining costs and I think we have given them one figure and they have given us another and we are going to get together, because we are very, very close to them. And we think that the Waco Dam and the series of dams recommended by the Army, authorized by the Congress, is a part of the overall plan for the control of the Brazos River.

The State agency has one function and the Army has another and together we try to control the whole river basin in as effective a manner as we can.

Mr. EVINS. Will you please tell the committee how much of the water the Brazos Authority proposes to acquire and how much you propose to pay for it?

Mr. KULTGEN. We would buy all of the conservation water not needed by the city of Waco at a price—at whatever appropriate price is determined by the Army, and whatever they tell us they want for it.

Mr. EVINS. You do not have any round-figure estimate, approximate figure?

Mr. KULTGEN. Mr. Chairman, the only figure that I can give you, that you can put your teeth in, would be the figures which the Army has offered to sell the water in the Belton storage reservoir for, which is $28.81 per acre-foot. There, again, no two dams are the same, and the policy of the Army will determine that, and we will pay just whatever they say we should pay for it; whatever reasonable figure they ask us to pay for it.

There is a desperate need and demand for all the water we can get; we are delighted to have it and we will be delighted to pay for it.

So I would say that we would buy whatever is left over above the needs of Waco, and we will pay the price that is determined by the Army, and we are now negotiating with them, and I do not think there will be any difficulty about that.

As a part of the record, in this Document 535, at page 73, wherein the Brazos Authority assumes the duty of disposing of the conservation water, which would be provided in the reservoir—and we are definitely trading now, and we are working very closely and, of course, the Brazos River Authority recognizes the need for this control of the Bosque, as a part of the master plan of the Brazos.

I think that about covers it, as far as the Brazos River Authority is concerned. We are doubly anxious to see this go forward as a part of the overall project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. JENSEN. The Army engineers must have given you some sort of a figure on the total repayment which the Brazos River Authority would pay over the period of the life of the project; the payback period on the project, whatever it may be. Have they not given you some sort of an estimate in millions of dollars?

Mr. POAGE. If I may interrupt, Mr. Chairman, I do not think, and I have not understood, that they have given us any kind of a figure.

If I have correctly understood it, the reason for not giving that kind of an overall figure is that nobody yet knows, in the first place, exactly how much of the water Waco will contract for, and, in the next place, after the city of Waco contracts—there was to be something like 100,000 acre-feet in this conservation pool, back of this dam, and the city of Waco would not need 100,000 feet at the present moment, or perhaps for a great many years to come.

Now, let us say they took one-third of that, leaving some 60,000 or 70,000 acre-feet to be sold to the district. Does that 100,000 acres also include the siltation pool?

Mr. KULTGEN. No.

Mr. POAGE. It does not?

Mr. KULTGEN. 65,000 siltation; 104,000 conservation storage.

Again, I say the only definite figure that has been mentioned in connection with this dam, Congressman Jensen, is the price of $24.81 at the Belton Dam, and the Government figures these dams in accordance with construction cost.

Mr. JENSEN. And I assume that the city of Waco has the first priority on the water?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. KULTGEN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. To the extent of their needs?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. And beyond that——

Mr. POAGE. At the same figure the Authority would pay, and in trying to use the Government's figures, we have no way of knowing, as yet, what the final cost will be. And all they could do would be to give an estimate, and the figure that has been mentioned here for the Belton Dam was $24.70.

Mr. EVINS. And it would be possible for them to come in later and say that it cannot be sold at the same price.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we do not want to prolong the hearing. Did you have anything further you wanted to say, Mr. Robertson?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No.

Mr. POAGE. We are very much obligated to you, Mr. Chairman, for the courteous consideration it has given to us.

Mr. EVINS. Did you want to make this statement a part of the record?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. It will be received and given consideration by the committtee.

(The statement referred to follows:)

WACO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Waco, Tex., May 11, 1955.

GENTLEMEN: The attached brief is one that was prepared for presentation to the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, in May 1954, and was in support of a portion of House Document 535, "Brazos River and Tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek, Tex." this being a report compiled by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army.

The Public Works Committee approved the Bosque River project; and the 83d Congress approved the project in its second session under flood control omnibus bill H. R. 9859.

Inasmuch as this project involves local participation on the part of the city of Waco, to provide municipal water supply, it is urgent that we pursue this matter with minimum delay.

We hereby request a hearing with the appropriate subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee at their earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

HARLON FENTRESS, *President.*

FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER SUPPLY NEEDS, WACO, TEX.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSE OF THIS PRESENTATION

To establish the urgent need that now exists in the city of Waco for assured flood control and water supply for the present and future.

Pertinent facts relative to this project are as follows:

1. This dam, plus Whitney, will afford flood protection and water conservation for approximately 400 miles downstream and control 96.5 percent of the drainage area of the Brazos River.
2. The city of Waco will participate financially.
3. This project holds No. 1 priority in the eyes of the United States engineers for the entire State.
4. The ratio of value received from Federal project is 42 percent greater than the expense.
5. Loss of water storage due to siltation and increased demand for water based on fast growth.
6. The city's alternate plan to provide additional water storage facilities, which will make it impossible for the city to participate in a Federal project at a future date.
7. The proposed city lake would afford a minimum of flood-control features.
8. The Brazos River Authority has, through its board of directors, agreed to purchase storage rights of surplus waters for conservation purposes in keeping with its statutory obligations and purposes, which will mean additional financial participation by this agency of the State of Texas. (See exhibit 2.)

GENERAL INFORMATION ON WACO

Waco is today a city with an estimated metropolitan population of 112,600 citizens. It is the county seat of McLennan County, which today has an estimated population of 146,800 citizens. Located in the heart of central Texas and the Brazos River Valley—one of the most fertile and productive regions in the entire Southwest—it has an elevation of 450 feet above sea level; annual rainfall 35.04 inches; mean annual temperature, 67.5° F. The growing season is 250 days. Waco is near the geographical center of Texas and almost exactly at the center of Texas' population density. This central location makes it an excellent distribution center and affords many commercial and industrial advantages not enjoyed by any other city in Texas.

It is the principal city and trading center of the Black Waxy region which is one of the largest cotton-producing areas in the United States. Although transition to an industrial economy is occurring, the economic life and growth of Waco are basically supported by the enormous production of McLennan County and the other counties comprising the rich central Texas (Brazos) Valley.

The agricultural importance of Waco is influenced by the fact that the only bridges over the Brazos River in McLennan County are located in Waco. Then, too, Waco and McLennan County are located approximately on the borderline of cotton, corn, dairy, poultry, and intensified type of agriculture of east Texas and the small grain, livestock, and extensive type of agriculture production of west Texas, and on the 35-inch rainfall line.

The United States census of agriculture survey showed that McLennan County had 4,295 farms on 585,000 acres of land, the average farm containing 136.2 acres.

In crops, McLennan County is the second ranking oat country in the State with 1,334,403 bushels. It also ranks high in corn, grain sorghums, barley, wheat, peanuts, cotton, sweetpotatoes, clovers, pecans, watermelons, legumes, peaches, berries, and other fruit and truck for market. It is one of Texas' leading staple crop counties.

Livestock production totaled 46,394 cattle of all types; 3,708,626 gallons of milk were produced, half of which sold commercially. In 1953, 7 million broilers were produced, making McLennan County one of the State's largest producers of fryers and broilers. 1,120,137 dozen eggs were produced. Beef cattle, hogs, horses, mules, sheep, lambs, wool, and some honey were sold. 14,363 turkeys were raised.

Value of crops based on plantings and prospective price for 1954 are estimated to be in excess of $15 million, while the livestock, poultry, and dairy products in McLennan County should account for approximately $16 million.

New areas are being opened for irrigation in the Brazos bottoms over gravel beds which supply water in vast quantities at 12- to 35-foot depths. New developments in agriculture are being studied and tested by farmers and ranchers of the area with the assistance of virtually every educational agency of the State and Federal Governments in the agricultural fields. This work includes the growing of special truck crops, intensive insect control in cotton, artificial insemination in dairy cattle and specialized broiler production.

Experiment stations and varied investigation work is being done by the United States Department of Agriculture and others, among which is the experimental watershed project of the Soil Conservation Service located in Riesel, Tex. The cotton insert laboratory and grasshopper control station of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine is located in Waco.

Emergence of an industrial economy in Waco is noted in the increase from a total manufacturing employment of 3,453 in 1940 to the present 8,340.

Waco has 254 manufacturers of varying size. Of these, 3 plants employ over 500 persons, 8 employ 250 to 500 persons each, 10 employ from 100 to 249 persons each and 196 employ less than 100 persons each. Altogether, there are approximately 8,340 people employed in manufacturing in Waco. They make a wide variety of products, including cotton goods, dairy products, sash and doors, built-in furniture and miscellaneous millwork, cement, concrete pipe, tents, awnings, work clothes, sporting goods, coffins and caskets, camp furniture, church furniture, venetian blinds, glass containers, tire covers, automobile tires, twine, denims, brooms, mops, laundry and dry cleaning equipment, printing, lithographing, advertising novelties, medicines, toilet preparations, engraving, iron and steel fabrications, bottled drinks, various food items, cottonseed products, women's clothing, cotton textiles, mattresses, cotton insulating materials, hats, monuments, and many other items.

The principal industries located in Waco are: William Cameron & Co., the largest woodwork mill in the South, with 98 branch houses located in Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico; Universal Atlas Cement Co., one of the Southwest's largest cement plants, a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corp.; Owens Illinois Glass Co., a $2 million glass-container factory employing some 750 persons; General Tire & Rubber Co., a $6 million automobile tire factory; Crawford-Austin Manufacturing Co.; Clifton Manufacturing Co.; Hawk & Buck Co.; J. M. Wood Manufacturing Co.; Texas Textile Mills; the Borden Co.; Western Stove Co.; Texas Coffin Co.; Weston Biscuit Co.; Union Asbestos & Rubber Co.

Waco has managed in an incredibly short time a changeover from a strictly agricultural economy to one that first struck a balance between agriculture and industry and now is tipping the scale in favor of industry. Brought about by having all the advantages of any other industry-minded town in Texas, a mild climate the year around, low-cost electric power and natural-gas fuel, plenty of good quality labor, nearby raw materials, and low taxes plus an extraordinary position for distribution.

More than 90 percent of the population of the entire Southwest, including the States of Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana, live within 400 miles of Waco. Within a radius of 200 miles of the city is 36 percent of this population, and 70 percent is within a 300-mile radius.

We have discussed the growth of the population at Waco and in McLennan County, and we have endeavored to show some of the economic forces which have contributed and will continue to contribute to this growth. There remains a consideration of the measure of these forces in terms of conventional indexes.

These indexes show business increases for 1954 on a comparative basic with 1940:

Population increase, 108 percent.

New people, 56,059.

25,844 more people employed, which is 46 percent greater than the national average.

Retail sales increased over 401 percent.

Wholesale sales increased over 545 percent.

Effective buying income, 264 percent.

In the last 14 years, building permits totaling $126,066,442 have been issued, which represent 10,668 residential permits and 12,403 nonresidential permits.
207 percent more telephones.
101 percent more water connections.
123 percent more gas connections.
109 percent more electrical connections.
366 percent more money in the bank.

FLOOD CONTROL

The following excerpts concerning flood control are taken from House Document No. 535, entitled "Brazos River and Tributaries, Oyster Creek and Jones Creek, Tex.," and are findings of the United States Corps of Engineers. This data was submitted August 9, 1939;

"The most frequent flooding has occurred along the Brazos River from about Waco to Hempsted. The frequency of occurrence of a flood year at various locations along the Brazos River, based upon stream-gaging records, is about once in 8.3 years of Kopperl, once in 2.1 years at Waco, once in 3.6 years at Valley Junction, once in 3 years at Washington, once in 1.9 years at Hempstead, and once in 8.3 years at Richmond.

"Economic analyses show that the greatest flood losses occur in the lower Brazos River Valley from the vicinity of Waco to the mouth and indicate that the plan of improvement for flood control should be designed primarily to reduce flooding in this region.

"Hydrologic studies reveal that major floods in the lower valley occur frequently, have large volumes and overflow the valley to a maximum depth of about 20 feet. These floods result from the unregulated flow from the Brazos River above Waco, augmented by flow from one or more of the major tributaries.

"Just above Waco, the Bosque River and several minor tributories enter the Brazos River. Protection of the lower valley by means of levees alone was considered impractical. Protection of the lower Brazos River Valley, however, by means of storage and reservoirs was found to be feasible. Certain of these reservoirs were found to be essential and justifiable elements in the plan for flood control. They are Whitney, Belton, Lampasas, Waco, and Proctor Reservoirs.

"It was apparent early in the investigation that any plan for general flood control on the lower Brazos would require reservoir storage on the Brazos River above Waco on the Leon River watershed. The Whitney Reservoir is located at the site furtherest downstream on the Brazos River suitable for the protection for the lower Brazos River Valley from the headwater floods, and therefore, was a key element in any plan for flood control."

After full consideration of the reports secured from the district and division engineers, the Board recommends provisions of the following additional reservoirs for flood control and allied purposes in the Brazos River Basin, Tex.: Waco Reservoir on the Bosque River; Proctor Reservoir on Leon River; Lampasas Reservoir on the Lampasas River; Laneport Reservoir on San Gabriel River; Somerville Reservoir on Yegua Creek and Ferguson Reservoir on Navasota River.

The Brazos River and its tributaries are subject to frequent and destructive floods. Eleven major floods and numerous lesser ones have occurred since 1899. No single flood has caused the highest known stages in all parts of the basin. The greatest general flood occurred in December 1913, and resulted in the maximum known stages at all points on Brazos River below Waco. The peak discharge of this flood at Valley Junction and below was 350,000 cubic feet per second. The peak discharge at Waco was experienced in September 1936, and amounted to 246,000 cubic feet per second. Flood damages in the watershed occurred principally along Brazos River between its mouth and the Whitney Dam site and in the basins of tributary streams entering that section. The flood plains in which the principal damages occur have a total area of about 1,413,430 acres, of which 763,650 acres are cultivated, 645,960 acres are grazing lands, and 3,820 acres are urban. Based upon recurrence of the experienced floods, the present state of development in the basin, and 1947 values, the district engineer estimates the average annual flood damages for the areas of principal damage at about $9,806,300, of which $6,970,900 are direct damages and $2,835,400 are indirect damages. The direct damages consist of $6,544,830 to rural property including crop losses, $300,230 to transportation facilities and utilities, and about $125,840 to urban properties.

"The Brazos River above Waco is deeply entrenched and confined in a narrow valley having steeply sloped sides or bluffs. The flood plain is narrow and contains a relatively small number of improvements or developments. For these reasons, there are no general or serious local flood problems in this reach of the river.

"Below Waco, the river emerges from the area of rugged topography into a rolling plains area and the river valley becomes wide and flat. The flood plain is extensively developed agriculturally and a number of small communities, mainline railroads, improved Federal and State highways, and county roads are found therein. Great floods on the Brazos River cause crop damage and seriously endanger these improvements. During large floods, the Brazos River, in its lower reaches, overflows the watersheds of Oyster Creek, Chocolate Bayou, Austin Bayou, and Bastrop Bayou on the east and watersheds of San Bernard River and Jones Creek on the west.

"Below Waco, the river follows a very sinuous course and its length is about twice the length of the general axis of the valley. The river banks are general unstable and there is considerable loss of land by bank erosion. The problem of bank erosion along the mouth was investigated by this office, a study of aerial mosaics and surface of the river revealed that erosion and movement of the channel is not limited to any given localities, but has occurred generally through the entire reach below Waco. The study indicates that approximately 19,300 acres of land have been lost through such action during the period 1900 to 1938.

"These reservoirs would reduce the discharges of such floods as occurred during the period of record, 1899 through 1945 for Brazos River and 1908 through 1945 for the tributary streams, to nondamaging flows immediately below the controlling dams. Due to the resulting reduction in natural valley storage and to the runoff from uncontrolled areas below the reservoirs, their effectiveness would be less at downstream points. For example at Waco on Brazos River, 26 damaging floods occurred during the period of record and the reservoirs would reduce the peak discharges of 25 of these if they should recur to nondamaging amounts, whereas of the 20 floods at Richmond during the same period, 13 would be fully controlled should they be repeated, and 7 partially controlled. The District Engineer estimates the annual benefits of the reservoirs from prevention of flood damages at $7,226,478 and from enhancement of land values, by making existing grazing lands suitable for cultivation, at $362,742, a total evaluated benefit from flood control of $7,589,220 annually.

"The system of reservoirs would control 27,567 square miles or 77.2 percent of the total contributing drainage area of the Brazos River. At Waco, 96.5 percent of the drainage area would be controlled."

In the conclusion of the engineers as appears in House Document 535 "regarding flood control and allied purposes it is concluded that damages from floods occur principally on the lower Brazos River from near Waco and its mouth and some certain portions of its tributaries thereto." Under recommendations of House Document 535, "The District Engineer recommends that the Federal Government adopt the following additional multiplepurpose reservoir projects for flood control and allied purposes on the Brazos River and tributaries, Texas:

Waco Reservoir on the Bosque River;
Proctor Reservoir on the Leon River;
Lampasas Reservoir on the Lampasas River;
Laneport Reservoir on the San Gabriel River;
Somerville Reservoir on the Yegua Creek;
Ferguson Reservoir on the Navasota River;

substantially as outlined in this report, at a total estimated first cost to the United States of $91,915,000 with $270,000 annually for operation and maintenance, subject to certain provisions of local cooperation pertaining to the Waco Reservoir project as follows:

"That the owners of the existing Lake Waco Dam and Reservoir shall permit the Federal Government to breach the existing dam and to utilize, without cost, any of the reservoir lands needed for the construction and operation of the new project in exchange for conservation storage equal to that existing in Lake Waco at that time."

From the foregoing excerpts from the engineers' report pertaining to the Brazos River in the general area of Waco and south, it can be clearly seen that with the completion of the Whitney Reservoir 38 miles north of Waco and the completion of the Belton Reservoir on the Leon River, that the next logical step would be to control the next principal tributary of the Brazos, the Bosque River, which feeds into the Brazos approximately 4 miles north of Waco.

Under the recommendations of the United States Engineers, as stated in House Document 535, you will note that the Waco Reservoir on the Bosque River holds a No. 1 priority. Inasmuch as it is not practical to approve all 6 reservoirs at one time, we certainly feel that we are justified in requesting the next project in line of priority, which is the Waco Reservoir on the Bosque River.

WATER SUPPLY

In House Document 535, the Corps of Engineers has included in the Waco Reservoir on the Bosque conservation storage of approximately 107,000 acre-feet for use at Waco's municipal water supply. Excerpts from House Document 535 dealing with his portion of our problem are as follows:

"The city of Waco made a specific request for a supplemental water supply and furnished assurance that the city would cooperate with the Federal Government to this end. Waco now obtains its water from Lake Waco, a small reservoir on the Bosque River. The capacity of this reservoir is being exhausted by siltation. Based on a survey made in February, 1936, the Soil Conservation Service estimated that the capacity of the existing reservoir would be depleted by 1955 or 1960. The proposed Waco Dam would be located 0.4 mile below the existing dam and its construction would inundate the existing dam and reservoir. Sufficient conservation storage would be provided in the new reservoir to permit an equitable exchange of storage plus any additional storage that the city may desire to purchase."

"The Brazos River Conservation and Reclamation District (now known as the Brazos River Authority) has offered to administrate the disposal of the conservation waters made available by the system of reservoirs proposed herein. The district is a State organization created for the purpose of controlling, storing, preserving, and distributing the flood, storm, and unappropriated flow of the Brazos River and its tributaries."

WATER PROBLEMS OF THE CITY OF WACO

When Lake Waco was completed in 1930, the storage capacity was 39,378 acre-feet. In 1947, when the Soil Conservation Service made their last survey on rate of sedimentation, it was found that Lake Waco had lost, as a result of sedimentation, 17,352 acre-feet of storage. This 1947 survey indicated that the Lake was about 44 percent filled and that the rate of siltation amounted to 2 percent annually, which would mean that as of 1954, approximately 58 percent of the original storage capacity of 39,378 acre-feet was lost. During the same time of loss of storage facilities for the municipal water supply, the city of Waco continued to grow and during the period between 1940 and 1954, Waco's population has increased 108 percent. The fact is that we have 108 percent more people to service with 58 percent less storage capacity.

Realizing that something must be done to give the City of Waco an assured water supply, the board of water trustees early last year employed the engineering firms of Joe J. Rady & Co. and Freese & Nichols to study the local problem and make recommendations regarding a new water supply for Waco. This report was submitted to the board of water trustees in September of 1953, and the recommendation of Mr. Rady was to construct a new dam on the North Bosque above the present Lake Waco at an estimated cost of $3,900,000 and unless we are able to obtain quick action from the Federal Government on the proposed Lake Waco Reservoir, the city will be forced to go ahead with its plans for the new Lake above the present Lake Waco. If this happens, it would, in our opinion, upset the long-range plans of the United States Engineers in their flood-control program for the Brazos for two main reasons: First, that with the necessary financing involved in the city project it would not be probable that the city could participate financially in the Federal project at a future date; and second, it would certainly cause a considerable change in the design of the proposed federal project.

It should be pointed out that the board of water trustees has realized for a number of years that our present water supply would be exhausted prior to 1960; but in view of the Brazos River survey as outlined in House Document 535 and high priority in which this Waco Reservoir was placed, it was everyone's opinion that we would do everything possible to cooperate with the Federal Government and engineers in their flood-control program; but due to the war, as you know, the flood-control projects not under construction were shelved. The time has now come that we must do 1 of 2 things: First, and

most logical is to request that this honorable committee recommend the authorization of the Waco Reservoir project in order to provide a water supply for the city of Waco, which is the largest metropolis in the Brazos Basin, and to provide flood control, not only for this area, but for all of the area south of Waco. The second choice, if the Federal project is not authorized, is for the city of Waco to take the money that it would have contributed towards the Federal project and invest in a smaller dam which would provide sufficient domestic water supply only.

The fact that the Corps of Engineers reports that the network of reservoirs above Waco, which includes the Waco Reservoir and Whitney, which is already completed, that 96.5 percent of the drainage area of the Brazos Basin would be controlled. It would certainly be a tremendous waste of time and money to alter the well-planned recommendations of the Corps of Engineers.

The willingness of the Brazos River Authority to cooperate in this project and also assist in a financial way by purchasing additional conservation storage would also mean a substantial amount of money that would be contributed toward the construction of this project and save the Federal Government some additional money. The Corps of Engineers also point out that the benefits of this project are 42 percent greater than its cost. Under the present Government policies on such projects, with local cooperation and financial participation, we sincerely believe that we are justified in our request.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
AUSTIN, TEX., *May 7, 1954.*

Hon. RUSSELL MACK,
Chairman, Flood Control Subcommittee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACK: On May 20, 1949, Hon. Beauford H. Jester, then Governor of the State of Texas, notified Chief of Engineers Office of his endorsement and approval of the report on the Brazos River and tributaries, Texas, Oyster Creek, Tex., and Jones Creek, Tex.

In view of the fact that your subcommittee has expressed an interest in considering the authorization of the Waco Reservoir on the Bosque River, I want to express to you my personal appreciation for the careful study I know your committee will give to this important project for inclusion in your flood-control and public-works program.

Texas is tremendously interested in flood control and water-supply problems and it is my understanding that the Waco Reservoir project will be a major factor in the completion of the Brazos Valley flood-control program and at the same time be extremely helpful to farmers in the lower reaches of the Brazos Basin. It is my understanding that there are no suitable damsites below the project in question, due to the character of the terrain, as can be substantiated by the report of the Army engineers.

Your favorable consideration of this project is urged. Incidental flood control and water allocation phases of the project can be developed appropriately later.

Very sincerely yours,

ALLAN SHIVERS, *Governor of Texas.*

BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY,
Mineral Wells, Tex., May 5, 1954.

To the Honorable Mayor and the Honorable Board of Water Commissioners of the City of Waco, Tex.:

GENTLEMEN: This letter is to convey to you the official endorsement by the board of directors of Brazos River Authority of your efforts to obtain immediate authorization of the proposed dam on the Bosque River near Waco, as described by the Corps of Engineers of the Army in its recommendations set forth in House Document 535, 81st Congress, 2d session.

As you know, Brazos River Authority is the agency of the State of Texas charged with the prevention of floods and the development and conversion to beneficial uses the storm, flood, unappropriated water of the entire Brazos River and its tributaries. For years the authority has recognized the necessity of, and has sought the aid of the United States engineers in accomplishing these objectives. This particular dam is an integral part of the system of dams

recommended by the Army engineers and Brazos Authority to control and conserve the waters of the Brazos River and its tributaries. It conforms exactly with the master plan of the authority and we doubt that its immediate necessity can be overemphasized.

The Possum Kingdom Dam, constructed by the authority, and the Whitney and Belton Dams constructed by the Engineer Corps, are steps of the master plan which have already been completed and we have long felt that the Waco Dam should be the next unit of the program to be undertaken.

In addition to the flood control which would be afforded by this project, the water of the Bosque is of high quality and there is an urgent need for any water that will be stored at the project, surplus to the needs of the city of Waco. Therefore, the Brazos River Authority is willing and anxious to purchase, or acquire on mutually satisfactory terms, the conservation storage over and above the needs of the city of Waco, which will be made available by this reservoir.

We, therefore, want to convey to you and to assure you of the wholehearted approval and support of Brazos River Authority in your efforts to obtain immediate and favorable action on this project.

Yours very truly,

R. D. COLLINS,
Treasurer-General Manager.

POINTS BROUGHT OUT IN AUTHORIZATION HEARING IN 1954

1. Army engineers have held that the Waco Dam is the first in the series of six dams that should be built on the Brazos and its tributaries.

2. There are no power facilities in the Waco Dam.

3. By Waco securing its water supply from this reservoir and paying its pro rata share, the Government and local interests will get a cheaper, overall solution to their respective problems.

4. Failure of Congress to authorize this project would force the city of Waco to build own facility which would cause the entire Brazos River Survey to be revised.

5. In addition to the tremendous monetary damages in the last 50 years, about 500 people have lost their lives because of floods.

6. The second problem is one of water conservation. There is a shortage of water now. The shortage is growing with the development of the area. Engineers estimate 1 year in every 7 is a year of critical, short supply; and some of these short periods have run for as much as 4 years.

7. Annual damages in the southern one-third of the basin in 1947 were estimated to be as high as $9,800,000 per year.

8. The river in the vicinity of Waco has a bankful capacity of 65,000 cubic feet per second. There have been floods in this area of over 350,000 cubic feet per second. There have been floods from this complex of over 650,000 cubic feet per second.

9. The Waco Reservoir will control 1,607 square miles of the Bosque River Basin, with a total storage of approximately 850,000 acre-feet. This reservoir would be at the head of the overall flooded area and would control water that would take effect all along the distance of the Brazos River. This dam would be approximately 420 water miles from the gulf.

10. The Waco Dam is to be located immediately above the outskirts of the city of Waco and at a point where it will control the three tributaries of the Bosque that come in immediately above Waco.

11. The engineers roughly estimate only because the details of design have not been developed that it appears the participation by the city of Waco would be in the neighborhood of $4 million to $5 million.

12. There was more water that passed Camero, Tex., below Waco, on one of the tributaries of the Brazos in one flood, at one time, than passed Kansas City at the time of the peak of the floods there. It was 630,000 second-feet, and I believe it was 615,000 at Kansas City.

13. The Waco Dam is at the lowest point that we can bring a dam in order to control the water that comes past Waco. So, we control the maximum runoff by building the structure there. We give protection not only to the vast flood plain below, but to the city through which it passes, because the Bosque River flows into the Brazos just above the city of Waco.

14. We are not asking the Federal Government to supply Waco with a municipal water supply. We are not asking the Federal Government to provide for the cost of any storage for Waco's water. We do think by putting our money in with

the Federal Government that we can get more flood control and more water storage for Waco for the same amount of money.

15. The Brazos River Authority approves of the Waco project. This is an agency of the State of Texas charged with the prevention of floods and the development of water conservation.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAYS CHANNEL, VICTORIA, TEX.,

INTRACOASTAL CANAL, COLORADO RIVER SEAWALL, GALVESTON, TEX.

WITNESSES

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

THEODORE R. ROBINSON, COUNTY JUDGE, GALVESTON, TEX.

Mr. EVINS. We are glad to have with us, and will be glad to hear at this time our colleague from Texas, Hon. Clark W. Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, my name is Clark W. Thompson, and I represent the Ninth Congressional District of Texas.

The projects which I would like to discuss briefly are all within the district I represent. There are two on which I would like to file briefs because these are the Guadalupe River Channel to the city of Victoria.

This Guadalupe River project is one we discussed with the Corps of Engineers, and it has been authorized since 1945. Planning money has been appropriated. Up to and including the present fiscal year. It is very much alive, in the opinion of the Army engineers, and is well up toward the top on the list of their recommended projects.

However, it is classified as a new project, and for that reason it has been deferred from time to time.

I would like to invite your attention to the fact that on the strength of the authorization of the project, there have been some very considerable invesments made along the outer channel; one by the DuPont Chemical Co. and the other by the Union Carbide Co. The latter is just now being completed.

The Union Carbide is presently building their own channel, up close to navigable water, into their own plant, and it is expected some day that it will be taken over by the Federal Government which, I think, is usual if we follow the precedent that has been established heretofore.

The full story is told by Mr. Richard Furman, the executive vice president and general manager of the Chamber of Commerce of Victoria, Tex., and representing the Victoria area. I would like to file that with you, with my own recommendation that it be given active consideration.

Mr. EVINS. The statement may be received for the record, Congressman Thompson.

(The statement referred to follows:)

GULF INTRA-COASTAL WATERWAYS CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TEX.,
BY RICHARD FURMAN

Texas history tells us that in 1840 the city council of Victoria was granted congressional authority to clear out the Guadalupe River, including a raft a few

miles below, and collect tolls. The following spring the steamer *Swan* navigated the Guadalupe up to Victoria. Because of the hazard of navigation and the lack of traffic at that time, the project was a failure as a transportation medium. In 1907, by authority of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1907, the Federal Government dredged a channel in San Antonio Bay 5 feet deep by 40 feet wide, removed snags, log rafts and shoals between the mouth of the Guadalupe River and Victoria, a total length of 68 miles. The construction was completed in 1909, but the maintenance of the project was abandoned in 1916 due to the lack of traffic and high maintenance costs. By the approval of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945, the existing project was modified to provide a channel 9 feet deep by 100 feet wide from a connection with the Intra-Coastal Canal approximately 138 miles west of Galveston, Tex., along the east shore of San Antonio, Guadalupe, and Mission Bays and the Guadalupe River to a point 3 miles above Victoria, Tex. About 1949, the proposed turning basin site was changed from its original site 3 miles above Victoria to a point about 3 miles below Victoria, saving the Federal Government 6 miles of dredging, the cost of construction and operation of two locks, and the cost of a diversion channel to the Guadalupe River, making the project a sea level canal. Local interests were relieved of the expense of 6 miles of rights-of-way, the cost of 2 bridges, and the necessity of requesting authority from the State Board of Water Engineers to divert water from the Guadalupe River to the canal for navigation purposes. It was felt that all available water should be saved for industry rather than for navigation.

Early in 1947, two navigation districts, the West Side Calhoun County and the Victoria County Navigation Districts, through which the proposed canal will extend, were created; bonds were issued; and navigation commissions established to handle the affairs of the districts. Since 1948 the Corps of Engineers have repeatedly requested construction funds for the project. The project report has been completed.

This is the seventh consecutive year we have appeared before you in behalf of the Guadalupe River Channel to Victoria, Tex., which was officially made an integral part of the gulf intracoastal waterways by Public Law 527, 82d Congress, House Report 6812, approved July 12, 1952. In 1948 when we presented our brief and first formal request for construction funds with which to start the project, we told you that big industry was anxious to come into the Victoria area because of our strategic location in the heart of the new industrial frontier. Our section of the Texas gulf coast has an unlimited supply of natural gas, an adequate supply of water for industry, an unlimited supply of sand and gravel, a very favorable labor situation, and a climate which permits year-round operation.

In 1949 the Du Pont Co. purchased some 1,700 acres of land on the proposed canal extension about 8 miles below the city of Victoria. In 1951 they completed a $50 million plant, where they are now employing 650 people and are making adiponitrile, an ingredient of nylon salts. This adiponitrile is shipped to their plant at Orange, Tex., made into nylon salts and shipped east to their plants, there to be made into nylon.

In October 1952 the Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Co., a subsidiary of the Union Carbide Co., started a $75 million plant on 1,500 acres of land which they purchased on our proposed canal extension about 25 miles below Victoria. They started opertaing the first unit of their plant on August 1, 1954, and have some 450 employees.

In October 1952 the Gifford-Hill-American Co. of Dallas, Tex., and California started construction on a plant at Victoria to manufacture high pressure concrete pipe of various sizes. Mr. Ray Foley, president of the company, stated that the site at Victoria was selected primarily because of the ample supply of sand and gravel, industrial water, and the possibility of water transportation. Mr. Foley stated that the plant, when completed, will employ approximately 200 men and that they expected to ship many thousands of tons by water transportation up and down the Texas coast and to other points available to water shipments.

These three important industries mentioned above selected the Victoria area because they needed water transportation and were convinced that the canal project would be carried through to completion. These three plants have created new jobs for more than 1,300 people with a combined payroll of more than $10 million annually.

Having full confidence in the merits of the project and believing that water transportation is of great importance to the industries located in our area, the navigation district has constructed the first 15 miles of the canal up to the Car-

bide & Carbon Chemicals plant with local funds. Revenue bonds in the amount of $1,300,000 were issued; contracts were let and construction will be completed by July 1, 1955.

The Guadalupe River Channel to Victoria is not a new project, it is an integral part of and an important feeder channel to the gulf intracostal waterways, that great transportation link which has proved its value to the Nation in times of peace and war. The project is necessary and vital, not only to the economy of the area and our National Government, but also to the industries which have already located along its proposed route, and to those industries which need water transportation and which are anxious to settle in that area because of the abundance of available power, industrial water, natural gas, labor, climate and other advantages.

Mr. THOMPSON. The next project I would like to discuss with you is the Colorado River. This, like the Guadalupe, is a feeder channel to the intracoastal canal system. It would be from the mouth of the Colorado River to a point near Bay City, Texas., it is comparatively inexpensive; it would cost less than $1 million to complete it.

Here, again, the local interests are proceeding as though appropriations are going to be made in each succeeding Congress. Refineries and various other industries are now being located on what will 1 day be that channel.

I believe I will leave that with you with that one comment on my part.

These people, through good faith that the Congress will authorize the project, and I tell them year after year that, in time when the backlog of these already-started projects have been worn down, that theirs should be pretty close to top priority.

I would like to file a statement by the mayor of the city of Bay City, on behalf of the Colorado River.

Mr. EVINS. It will be received and certainly be given consideration.

(The matter referred to follows:)

BAY CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Bay City, Tex., May 5, 1955.

The CHAIRMAN,
House Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Due to unforeseen circumstances, I am forced to return to Texas without being able to appear in person in behalf of our approved project of dredging a tributary channel from the intracoastal canal to the 17-mile post upstream on the Colorado River.

I wish to state that one of the big obstacles in the past of dredging this channel has been the need for a high-structure bridge over the Colorado River. I might state that all rights-of-way have been acquired for this road and bridge, that meetings have been held with the Army engineers and with the highway department, and that plans are going forward at this time to spend approximately $2 million in the construction of the bridge and approaches over the Colorado River. Several thousand dollars have been spent in engineering, abstracting, and plans for the acquiring of rights-of-way on the Colorado River.

Recently, a large company has taken an option on a thousand acres on the Colorado River, and two of their basic requirements were barge traffic and industrial water. We were able to assure them of ample industrial water as well as natural gas, and also that we have the approved project at a very minimum cost of dredging the Colorado River to the 17-mile post.

The multimillion dollar refinery now operating near the Colorado River has been completed and they are now finding it necessary to truck in, in large tank trucks, inflammable materials through the heart of the business and residential sections of the city of Bay City—some 33 miles—to the intracoastal canal where their product is loaded on its barges, and barged to eastern markets.

With the completion of the Colorado River navigation project this hazard would be eliminated. Proper plans have been made for loading facilities on the

Colorado River by the refinery, and a high volume of tonnage will be made available for barge traffic.

Recently, Halliburton Oil Supply Co. constructed a large district office in Bay City which will become the distribution center for their product for the mid-gulf coast. This company has gone on record in previous hearings pledging a quarter of a million tons of barge freight to be transported on the Colorado River when our approved project is completed.

Since this project has been approved since 1938, and since the total cost of construction is less than $750,000, we feel that serious consideration should be given to the starting and completion of the first part of our construction program, that is, the 8 miles up to the present bridge which will serve as one of the best ports of refuge on the entire gulf coast at the nominal cost of only $250,000.

Therefore, at this time, we are urging that an appropriation of $250,000 be earmarked for the Colorado River approved project to be followed by the completed project when the new highway bridge is completed which will allow proper navigation up to the 17-mile post or to the turning basin of the approved Colorado River development project.

Sincerely,

R. C. GUSMAN,
Chairman, Colorado River Development Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Gentlemen, I have with me the county judge of Galveston County who wants to file a brief and may have a short statement in behalf of the extension of the Galveston seawall.

Mr. Chairman, this seawall is a little bit unusual—there is a 3-mile extension authorized by the Congress. The local participation is about 5 to 3, with the Government contributing five million.

Some years ago, when final authorization was passed by the Congress we made a rather unusual request which was that the county be permitted to go ahead and spend its money. The bonds had been voted and sold and we wanted to proceed with our share of the construction. Then after it was completed, we would take our chance on the Federal Government going ahead with it's five-eighth share of the project. Our share is now completed. It has opened up a new section of the city; it has given protection where none was had before, and there has been a great deal of growth behind the new seawall.

With your indulgence, I would like now for you to hear Judge Robinson.

Mr. EVINS. We will be glad to hear you, Judge Robinson.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, for the record, my name is Theodore R. Robinson. I am county judge of Galveston County, Tex. You gentlemen have been very patient here today; you have had a trying time. I once thought I would like to be a Congressman, but after seeing what goes on, I think I will be satisfied to remain a county judge.

I have prepared here, and I can furnish eight copies if you wish, a rather full statement concerning this project, which I would like to file with the committee.

Mr. EVINS. It may be received.

(The statement referred to follows:)

GALVESTON, TEX., *May 13, 1955.*

The COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: On November 30, 1953, the United States completed another link in the fortification of the city of Galveston, Tex., against the ravages of the Gulf of Mexico. This further extension of the Galveston County, Tex., westend seawall was constructed entirely with funds contributed by Galveston County, Tex. This defense system began after Galveston's first major storm on Septem-

ber 8, 1900, when this fine city was swept by hurricane winds accompanied by a 15-foot tide that swept the city causing property damage reported to be over $25 million and a loss of more than 6,000 lives; 2,600 homes were destroyed and up to 300 feet of land was lost by erosion of the shore. The city had been practically destroyed, but the citizens of Galveston fought back with the usual courage and determination that always prevails when our citizens are in peril. By July 1904 a seawall 17,593 feet long had been constructed by Galveston County, Tex., extending from the inner end of the south jetty at Eighth Street and Avenue A, along Sixth Street to Broadway, and then along the gulf shore to 39th Street.

While this seawall was being constructed, the United States Congress authorized the construction of a seawall of similar design along the front of Fort Crockett Military Reservation. This reservation is located between 39th and 53d Streets beyond the end of the county wall as originally constructed. The Fort Crockett seawall is 4,935 feet long and ties in 3 concrete gun emplacements on the reservation. It was constructed immediately following completion of the county wall at 39th Street, being started in December 1904 and completed in October 1905.

The River and Harbor Acts of July 27, 1916, and September 22, 1922, authorized the extension of the then existing county seawall along the gulf front of the city of Galveston, Tex., from its angle at Sixth Street and Broadway eastward to the south jetty with protection at its junction with the south jetty, to provide protection to the outer end of Galveston Channel from the effects of tropical cyclones. This seawall extension was completed in January 1926. The total length of this extension being 13,162 feet of which 3,362 feet was built with funds contributed by Galveston County, Tex.

Galveston County also extended the seawall from the Fort Crockett Military Reservation at 53d Street to 61st Street, a distance of 2,800 feet, thus giving a continuous seawall along the entire front of the city of Galveston. This extension was completed in June 1927.

The completion of this section brought the seawall to 61st Street. The total length of seawall constructed to that point is 38,490 feet, or 7.29 miles, of which 23,735 feet was constructed by Galveston County, Tex. and 14,755 feet constructed by the United States. With the completion of the present southwesterly extension of the seawall from 61st Street a distance of 5,540 feet, makes the total length now completed 44,030 feet or approximately 8½ miles.

From June 1927 to 1944, the city of Galveston, Tex., continued to grow westward. If this section was to grow, it was evident that additional seawall protection would have to be given this area. With this in mind, and for the protection of the lives and property of those living west of 61st Street, and in order that the city of Galveston, Tex., could continue to grow and expand, the county commissioners' court initiated the further extension of the seawall in a southwesterly direction for a distance of 16,300 feet or a little over 3 miles.

In this effort; Galveston County solicited the support of the late Hon. J. J. Mansfield of Columbus, Tex., who was then our Representative in Congress. Congressman Mansfield was successful in securing the adoption of a resolution in Congress on November 20, 1945, which authorized the making of the necessary reports by the United States Corps of Engineers.

By virtue of the authorization contained in this resolution, Col. D. W. Griffiths, United States district engineer, on January 8, 1946, held a public hearing in the county court room in the city of Galveston, Tex., to determine the improvements desired by Galveston County and to afford all interested parties an opportunity to express their views concerning the desired improvements. There were 70 persons present, including Congressman J. J. Mansfield, the mayor and board of commissioners of the city of Galveston, Tex., and the county judge and county commissioners of Galveston County, Tex., representatives of civic organizations and business, property owners, and other interested persons.

A request for a southwesterly extension of the then existing seawall for a distance of 16,300 feet was presented by the county judge, on behalf of the Galveston County commissioners' court and the people of this city. This request was endorsed by official statements from the board of city commissioners and civic organizations of the city, and was supported by a brief filed by Galveston County.

After an extensive survey, which required about 18 months to complete, Col. D. W. Griffiths, United States district engineer at Galveston, made the following recommendations:

"It is recommended that a project be authorized providing for extending the existing seawall in a southwesterly direction for a distance of approximately

16,300 feet along the shore of the Gulf of Mexico, generally as described in this report, at an estimated total first cost for construction of $8,420,000, of which $5,550,000 (cost at present prices $8,070,000) is to be borne by the United States and $2,870,000 by the local interests, on the condition that local interests in addition to contributing $2,870,000 toward the construction cost shall furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will furnish free of cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project. Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction of the project, and maintain all project works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War."

On August 23, 1947, an election was held by the Galveston County Commissioners' court seeking authority to issue seawall bonds for the financing of the seawall extension project. This bond issue was approved by the voters of this county by a majority of about 4 to 1.

On April 28, 1948, Col. Henry Hutchings, Jr., Division Engineer, of the United States Corps of Engineers, concurred with the district engineer in recommending the 16,300 feet extension of the Galveston seawall.

Galveston County was officially notified of these favorable recommendations of both the district and division engineers, and were afforded an opportunity to furnish additional information to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in Washington. We requested a formal hearing which was granted and a hearing date set in Washington on June 8, 1948. I personally appeared before this Board in Washington accompanied by Congressman Clark W. Thompson and W. J. Aicklen, chairman of the seawall extension committee of the chamber of commerece of the city of Galveston, and others. We presented formal briefs and orally presented Galveston's case to the Board. On the same date, the Board approved the reports of the district and division engineers and further recommended the construction by the United States of an extension of the existing Galveston seawall in a southwesterly direction for a distance of approximately 16,300 feet along the shore of the Gulf of Mexico, generally in accordance with the plan of the district engineer, and at the cost indicated.

On February 28, 1949, the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, after a review of the reports of the district, and division engineers and the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, approved the views and recommendations of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. On the same date the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, transmitted to the Secretary of the Army, the various reports above referred to.

On March 1, 1949, Beauford H. Jester, Governor of Texas, approved the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers for the extension of the seawall at Galveston.

On April 15, 1949, Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress the report from the Chief of Enigneers, United States Army, dated February 28, 1949.

After 5 years of effort, Galveston County was finally successful in getting its request for the extension of the seawall before the United States Congress.

In April 1949, I presonally appeared before a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives who was considering, for the Congress, an omnibus River and Harbors bill containing the seawall extension. In this hearing I was accompanied by Congressman Clark W. Thompson who ably assisted me at that hearing.

The bill was reported out favorably and in 1950 was passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. This act of Congress authorized the construction of a 3-mile southwest extension of the seawall at Galveston by the United States contingent upon Galveston County complying with the terms of said act. Shortly after this authorization by Congress the Korean war began, and a Presidential order was issued that funds would be allotted only for projects carrying military significance. This looked as if the seawall extension project after all this effort would be halted for the duration of the Korean war, but through the fine assistance and cooperation of Congressman Clark W. Thompson, who was able ot prevail upon President Truman to let us go ahead with our own money, we were able to continue our efforts to get construction under way.

The seawall bonds which were voted by the people were sold and thus $3 million was raised for construction purposes. After the money was in hand it became doubtful that the commissioners' court had legal authority to contribute to the United States the $2,870,000 as required under the act of Congress. To

surmount this legal obstacle Senator Jimmie Phillips, at the request of the commissioners' court, introduced a bill in the Texas Legislature which was passed by both Houses of the Texas Legislature and signed by the Governor of Texas on April 12, 1951, authorizing us to make this contribution to the United States.

On May 15, 1951, it was my personal privilege and honor to personally present to Col. Ellsworth I. Davis, district engineer at Galveston, the county's check for $2,870,000 to comply with the act of Congress so construction of the seawall could begin.

Bids were called for by the United States District Engineer at Galveston and the best bid submitted was by Trotti & Thomson of Beaumont who bid construction of 5,151.5 feet of seawall.

Ground breaking ceremonies starting actual construction were held on September 26, 1951, and construction of this section was completed on November 30, 1953.

The construction of this last extension of the Galveston County westend seawall was by virtue of an act passed by the 81st Congress, 1st session in 1950, and may be found of record in House of Representatives document No. 173. Said House of Representatives document No. 173 being specifically referred to herein for all purposes and is made a part hereof the same as if copied herein in full.

The act of Congress above referred to authorized the extension of the existing Galveston seawall in a southwesterly direction for a distance of approximately 16,300 feet along the shore of the Gulf of Mexico for an estimated total first cost for construction of $8,420,000, of which $5,550,000 (cost at present prices $8,070,000) is to be borne by the United States and $2,870,000 by Galveston County, Tex., on condition that Galveston County, Tex., in addition to contributing the $2,870,000 toward the construction cost would furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will—

"(a) Furnish free of cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project.

"(b) Hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction of the project.

"(c) Maintain all project works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War."

Galveston County, Tex., has fully and completely complied with all of its obligations, including a contribution to the United States in the sum of $2,870,000 and has furnished to the Secretary of War all assurances as called for in said act of Congress.

The citizens of Galveston County, Tex., feel that the United States has entered into a solemn contract with them to construct 16,300 feet of additional seawall as provided in said act of Congress and that having made their contribution of $2,870,000 in cash and having furnished all assurances requested of them by the Secretary of War and said extension being now partially completed, that the United States Congress is morally if not legally bound to comply with the terms of the act of Congress and to appropriate a sufficient sum of money to complete this project, which was estimated in said act of Congress to be approximately $5,550,000 (cost at present prices $8,070,000).

Wherefore, premises considered, Galveston County, Tex., prays that this honorable committee authorize an appropriation of $8,070,000 for the next fiscal year so that the Galveston westend seawall can be completed for a total distance of 16,300 feet as authorized by the 81st Congress, 1st session.

Respectfully submitted.

THEODORE R. ROBINSON,
County Judge, Galveston County, Tex.

Mr. ROBINSON. Briefly, Galveston, as you probably know, is subject to severe West Indies hurricanes. We had a very severe hurricane in 1900, and at a time when there was no seawall, when the city was practically destroyed; 6,000 people died, and millions of dollars worth of property damages were suffered.

At that time the city was unable to finance a seawall and the people of the county started on the construction of a seawall to protect the city. Later the Federal Government, in order to protect Fort San Jacinto built a wall to the east.

The Government picked up again on the west of 39th Street and went to 53d Street. Then the county picked it up at 53d Street and took it on to 61st Street.

Then in 1950 the Congress authorized the construction of an additional extension of 16,300 feet. In that act they said to the people of Galveston that the Government will extend this wall 16,300 feet provided Galveston County will contribute $2,807,000 in cash, and will furnish all of the necesary rights-of-way and assurances usually provided for.

In 1951, through the fine efforts of Congressman Thompson, and due to the danger from storms at Galveston, we were permitted to go ahead with this part of the project. We say the county. Actually the construction of 1 mile of this seawall was entirely under the supervision of the United States Corps of Engineers, and I assume is a project of the Federal Government. That was completed in November 1953.

In the act of Congress, the Corps of Engineers estimated the cost, the Government's cost, at $5,550,000, or a ratio of approximately 65 to 35. However, before leaving Galveston, the district engineer asked me to advise this committee that the cost of construction and completion of this seawall has increased from $5,550,000 to $8,070,000, so from an economical standpoint it would appear advisable to complete the project as soon as possible.

Mr. EVINS. Gentlemen, we thank you very much for your testimony.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1955.

CORPUS CHRISTI BASCULE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND TULE LAKE CHANNEL EXTENSION

WITNESSES

HON. JOHN BELL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS
DALE MILLER, REPRESENTATIVE OF PORT OF CORPUS CHRISTI
FARRELL SMITH, MAYOR OF CORPUS CHRISTI
W. J. ROBERTS, CITY COMMISSIONER
W. W. ANDERSON, CITY PLANNING DIRECTOR
DUANE ORR, DISTRICT ENGINEER, NUECES COUNTY NAVIGATION DISTRICT
JOHN YOUNG, COUNTY JUDGE, NUECES COUNTY
HORACE CALDWELL, COUNTY COMMISSIONER
JOHN J. SABLATURA, COUNTY COMMISSIONER
WILLIAM E. McKINZIE, COUNTY COMMISSIONER
BEN BENNETT, COUNTY COMMISSIONER
J. C. HARRIS, ASSISTANT COUNTY ENGINEER

Mr. EVINS. You made a statement this morning and you are back again this afternoon, Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. That is right.

My name is Dale Miller, a representative of the port of Corpus Christi.

I would like to make just a brief introductory statement and present the witnesses who will testify.

We are here in support of two projects, construction funds for both of which are recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

One of them is the Tule Lake extension of the Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway. It involves construction funds to continue work on a project already underway by virtue of construction funds made available by Congress last year. That testimony will require only a brief time and we will reach that at the conclusion of our testimony on the major project, the removal and relocation of the bridge at the entrance to the port of Corpus Christi.

Mr. Chairman, I will present those members of our county and city government who are here who will not testify. I will simply ask them to raise their hands as I call their names so that they may be identified.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer for the record these briefs which have been placed in front of you. Much of them consists of photographs and maps which may not be appropriate for inclusion in the record.

Mr. EVINS. These will be received for consideration of the committee and we will determine whether they will be incorporated in the public report or not.

Mr. MILLER. We are glad to leave to the judgment of the committee what portions should be included in the record.

I would like to present to you now, with your permission, the Mayor of Corpus Christi, the Honorable Farrell Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Miller.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as Mr. Miller has said, my name is Farrell Smith and I am the mayor of the city of Corpus Christi, Tex. The other members of the city here who are with me, Mr. Roberts, city commissioner, and Mr. Anderson, our planning director and planning engineer, have been introduced.

We have come here to show you the facts which we think justify and support our request of you to appropriate funds for the Federal Government's share of the cost of relocating and replacing our bascule bridge at the entrance to the port of Corpus Christi.

The present bridge is a serious obstruction to the entrance to the port and constitutes an unreasonable danger and hazard to navigation and threatens the economy of our community. It was built by local interests 29 years ago, in 1926, when Corpus Christi was a city of about 25,000 people.

Since that time Corpus Christi has grown to where it is now a city of 160,000. It is increasing its population, doubling it almost every 10 years, and has for the past 4 decades.

Since that time oil production has been brought in. Within an area of 100 miles of Corpus Christi one-twelfth of the Nation's oil reserves exist. We have now the Naval Air Station, which is the Nation's largest naval training command. In addition to that, we have numerous refineries, 12 or 15 of the largest refineries, and many industries.

All the ships that come into our port go under and through the bascule bridge. A large part of our rail transportation comes over it, and all of the vehicular traffic, automobiles and the like, and buses, that go from North Beach, the north end of our city, to the city proper, have to cross over it.

Every time that a ship comes through—and there are 13,000 vessel movements a year—the drawbridge is raised up. There are around 20,000 to 22,000 cars a day going over the bridge and they have to stop and wait for the ships to come through and wait for them to lower the bridge. It is at the point where it has stopped all our traffic through there over and over again.

In addition to that, it is very narrow. It is about 90 feet wide from fender to fender.

Your typical tankers and oceangoing vessels of today cannot come in there. The Government has tripled the size of our port with appropriations in effect now. We will need this obstruction to navigation removed. That is why we are here to give you the facts supporting our request.

There are 4 or 5 things that I would like to point out.

The first is that all of the responsible interests in the area, and in Corpus Christi, are of a single mind. We are all unified in our plan. We have developed a plan which solves the problem adequately and economically. The plan was developed by our engineers with the help of more than 100 citizens. The Army Corps of Engineers, the State highway department, the navigation district, the county commissioners court, the city, and the area development committee have all agreed, and by resolution shown in these booklets endorsed this single plan.

Mr. EVINS. How many accidents have you had on this narrow bridge in the past 5 years?

Mr. SMITH. Sir, there have been numerous ones. They are listed to the dollar amount of damage. There have been several major accidents.

Mr. EVINS. Can you give us in round figures the approximate damage?

Mr. MILLER. I think that Mr. Orr will cover that in his testimony.

Mr. SMITH. It is so narrow that ships run into it constantly.

Mr. EVINS. This is a case of a city bursting forth at the seams and outgrowing itself, and you have an outmoded bridge into the city?

Mr. SMITH. Exactly, sir.

Mr. EVINS. How many hours a day would you say that bridge is open and how long is the vehicular traffic held up in the course of 24 hours?

Mr. ORR. Four and a half hours out of every 24.

Mr. SMITH. There is a great urgency on this, too, as you can see from the facts. It is a part of a 25-year area-development plan worked out with land use and the thoroughfares with the State highway department. It is a very well worked out plan. It has had many engineering minds and many other good minds working it out. Out of the $70 million bridge and express-highway program that we will spend and develop in th next 10 years, $25 million of it relates to this bridge removal. We are asking the Federal Government to absorb 16 percent of it under the Truman-Hobbs Act, that is $4,085,000. The rest of the $25 million, relating to the bascule bridge, will be paid for by local interests.

This year the President in the budget for the first year's work has recommended $1,500,000. That is about the very minimum we could get by with in the first year, but we could adequately and satisfactorily

and effectively use up to $3,200,000 during the first year and effect a much earlier completion date on it if this committee can see fit to recommend more than $1,500,000.

I thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mr. Chairman, if I may now, I will introduce Mr. Orr, the district engineer for Nueces County Navigation District.

Mr. ORR. Thank you, Mr. Miller.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if some of you are looking at that blue brief, you will notice the cars backed up on the other side. It is a little hard to see. It does show the congestion. In other words, every time the bridge goes up the cars are backed up on either side for at least half a mile. If you catch a long delay, it will be for an even greater distance than that.

One of the things that makes the situation extremely bad is that the peak movement of vessels is also the peak hours for the vehicular traffic. It makes an even more serious situation than just the pure figures would indicate.

But the bascule bridge, as the mayor pointed out, was constructed in 1926. However, it was not long before local interests saw that the bridge would be inadequate for future marine traffic in a rapidly growing port.

Numerous plans have been proposed, each of which would solve some phase of the bascule-bridge-bottleneck problem. But it was not until 1950 that the area development committee was created as an agency of the chamber of commerce to prepare a comprehensive plan for solving the bascule-bridge-bottleneck problem. This problem is particularly complicated because there are three forms of transportation intersecting at a common point; that is, the waterways, the highways, and the railways.

Also, there are numerous agencies involved in the solution of it, which again complicates the problem. These agencies include the Corps of Engineers, the city of Corpus Christi, Nueces County, the Nueces County Navigation District, the Southern Pacific Railroad, the Missouri Pacific Railroad, the Texas-Mexican Railroad, and the Corpus Christi Railroad, all of which have a part in the satisfactory solution to all which must be arrived at by local interests.

This has been accomplished. In 1951 the area development committee presented its comprehensive plan for solving the bascule bridge bottleneck problem.

On December 10, 1952, the Corps of Engineers held a hearing at Corpus Christi to determine if the bridge was a hazard and an obstruction to navigation. Testimony was presented at that time to show that the bridge was a hazard to navigation, and that it was adversely affecting the growth of the port, and the community.

At the hearing the city of Corpus Christi presented the plan which had been prepared by the area development committee for solving the bascule bridge problem. This plan, as the mayor has stated previously, had ben adopted by all of the local public agencies as well as other local civic groups.

Before explaining the plan, I have a few briefs statements which I would like to point out on a map, here, which I believe will familiarize you with the location of the project.

The Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway is located on the Texas gulf coast about two-thirds of the way down the coast between the Texas-Mexican border, and the Texas-Louisiana border.

The Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway is the waterway serving the port of Corpus Christi. The channel into Port Aransas is shown from Port Aransas into Corpus Christi, in purple on this map. The main turning basin and the existing deep waterway is shown in blue.

The bascule bridge is very noticeable, but the fact that the waterway has a low cut into there before you reach the main harbor is important. Next, we have the industrial canal here, going up to the Avery Turning Basin, and then beyond there, in green, is shown the Tule Lake extension, which we will discuss a little bit later.

However, I wanted to show you that all of the projects are related there.

The solution of this problem can be summarized in four steps:

No. 1, the construction of a high-level bridge near the present bascule bridge, and the harbor entrance, for vehicular traffic. This bridge will provide a connection to the industrial area on the north, to the major highways leading to the north and east, from Corpus Christi, and in the plan it was proposed that this bridge would have a 140-foot vertical clearance, and sufficient horizontal width to permit the largest vessels to enter and leave the port in utmost safety. Also, it was arranged so that the channel entrance to the harbor could be realined as shown in green there, to remove the dog leg, and to be widened to 400 feet, in conformity with the authorized project across the bay.

The second phase of the project is the construction of the upper harbor bridge under the Tule Lake project. That is about 4 miles inland from the present bascule bridge.

This bridge is to be constructed under the Truman-Hobbs Act, and is to be a combination rail and highway vertical-lift bridge, with a horizontal clearance of 300 feet between fenders, and 140 feet vertical clearance above mean high tide in the open position.

The present bascule bridge carries 2 lanes of highway traffic and 1 railroad track.

Mr. EVINS. In other words, you plan to construct two bridges?

Mr. ORR. That is right; we will construct 2 bridges instead of 1.

Mr. EVINS. You will construct one bridge at the present location and a new one farther on down?

Mr. ORR. That is right.

May I point out that the high-level vehicular bridge at the mouth of the harbor is to be constructed by local interests at no direct Federal expense. The only project for which we are asking Federal funds is the Truman-Hobbs bridge located at this point.

There is shown in the brief a sketch of the bridge at the upper harbor crossing.

Mr. EVINS. Has there been any contribution by the railroads or others in connection with the bridge?

Mr. ORR. The contributions will be borne by local interests under a previous agreement with the railroads which was made back in 1922.

The railroads will contribute in the matter of betterments, but under the contract the local interests were responsible for relocations.

The plan, in addition to construction of the bridge, proposes the construction of certain railroad tracks shown in red, the yards over on the north side, here, the connecting track around to the railroad on the south side, and connection across town to the railroad to the south.

This will permit the elimination of numerous railroad tracks on city streets, and will also offer better rail service to the port, and the adjacent industrial area.

The railroad relocation is a part of the Truman-Hobbs project for the bridge.

Upon completion of the high-level bridge, and the left bridge, the next step in the project will be the actual removal of the present bascule bridge. This cannot be accomplished, of course, until means are provided to take care of the rail and highway traffic.

Upon the removal of the present bascule bridge, it will be possible then to go ahead and dredge the realined channel, as shown in green on the map there, which will provide adequate waterway for the modern vessels to enter.

Mr. EVINS. You have an interesting plan, and you have shown lots of vision in the work which has gone into this planning.

Mr. ORR. Well, there has been a committee of citizens and members of the county commissioners court, the city government, and navigation commission, which have all worked together very closely in trying to arrive at what they call a 25-year comprehensive plan, so that they would not be faced with the problem with which we are now faced.

Following the hearing on December 10, 1952, the Secretary of the Army found that the bridge was an unreasonable obstruction to navigation, and that it should be removed, and at the same time of his finding, he made known to the Corps of Engineers on what basis he would negotiate a contract for removal and replacement of the bridge.

The Corps of Engineers favored the plan of the city, which it had presented for relocation of the bridge, and they proceeded on the basis that that was the plan.

However, the Corps of Engineers indicated to the city that they would participate only to the extent of the Federal Government's obligation under the construction of a hypothetical bridge.

In other words, the hypothetical bridge would be another bridge constructed adjacent to the present bascule bridge, which would be adequate for navigation.

The Federal Government's contribution would be limited to the cost of that structure, and any additional cost would have to be borne by local interests.

The city agreed to this stipulation, and a contract has been signed with the Secretary of the Army, acting for the Federal Government.

The cost of this relocation project is estimated at $5.9 million, of which the Federal Government's share would be $4,085,000, but the right of way for the high-level bridge and the construction of the high-level bridge, as well as the road and railroad connections, on either end of both bridges, bring the total cost of these projects to $25,017,000, of which, as the mayor pointed out, the Federal participation represents 16 percent.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Orr, your plans are more elaborate now than originally intended, or submitted, and I want to ask you the question as to whether all of these plans have been agreed upon, and whether or not they are firm, and whether everyone is in agreement on them.

Mr. ORR. Yes, sir.

The majority of the people are in agreement and I am sure that the county judge, who will follow me, can express from the standpoint of the voters what their sentiment is in regard to the plan.

I will leave that to him, with your permission.

The local governments, of course, are extremely anxious for these projects to go forward.

Mr. EVINS. How much longer is your statement?

Mr. ORR. Just about 2 minutes.

Local governmental bodies are extremely anxious that removal of this obstructive bridge be expedited since it vitally affects the port, the Nation, and the community.

Operations of the principal industries located behind the bridge are being adversely affected because of higher transportation costs due to the bridge which prevents the larger and more economical tankers from loading at the port of Corpus Christi.

In that connection, we respectfully urge that the $1.5 million recommended by the Bureau of the Budget be appropriated to begin work on this project, during the next fiscal year, and if you gentlemen should see fit, as the mayor pointed out, since local funds are already available, to appropriate a larger sum, we can use additional Federal funds advantageously to rush completion of this project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Orr.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, we would like to hear from our county judge at this time, Judge Young.

Mr. HAND. Before we proceed with the testimony of Judge Young, I would like to ask one question:

The total overall cost to the Federal Government is the figure which you mentioned of $4 million?

Mr. ORR. $4,085,000.

Mr. HAND. That is the total Federal obligation?

Mr. ORR. That is right.

Mr. EVINS. Judge Young, you may proceed.

Mr. YOUNG. I am John Young, county judge of Nueces County.

We, of course, are tremendously interested in this program, as evidenced by the fact that the entire court has come up here to see you about it.

You asked a question a moment ago about how this plan was being received down in Nueces County, and of course, naturally, you all know what we are doing about the project down there, since we are up here asking you to help us.

The county commissioners court submitted to the people of Nueces County the largest bond issue ever submitted in the history of the county, in order to correct this bascule bridge bottleneck problem, as it is unpopularly known down there.

In that bond issue election, Mr. Chairman, more than 33 percent of the entire qualified voters turned out and voted, which was unprecedented in that area, and approved the bond issue by more than 92 percent of the people voting; in other words, almost 12 to 1.

In the area to the west of the city of Corpus Christi, which is actually the area which will be directly affected, so to speak, in that these improvements will be located in that area, I asked the county clerk down there to certify for me a list of returns; and bear in mind, sir, that the navigation district bond issue of $750,000 was simply and purely for this program, and nothing else was involved in it at all.

Those returns were certified, and I asked the clerk to place an asterisk beside the polling place, and I would like to read the results of that certificate:

For, 100; against, 9.
Another box: For, 99; against, 9.
Another box: For, 171; against, 24.
Another box: For, 314, against, 9; or some 35 to 1 on that last box.

Mr. EVINS. Has your vote for Congressman John Bell down there been in that some proportion?

Judge YOUNG. We voted pretty heavily down there for him, Mr. Chairman.

The bond issue carried by an overwhelming majority.

We have every reason to believe that every responsible person in that county is for it.

As to what we are doing down there: I know my time is up. Gentlemen, we are progressing with this program, and we are actually in the process of acquiring the rights-of-way for this vehicular bridge which will replace the old bascule bridge, and all we need now is the assistance of the Federal Government, and we will have this thing rolling in short time.

Mr. EVINS. Judge, you have made a good statement.

Judge YOUNG. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, that will conclude the testimony on this particular project.

In a moment, Mr. Orr will speak briefly on the other project, the Tule Lake extension, but first I would like to ask our Congressman, Congressman Bell, to make a few remarks.

Mr. EVINS. We shall call on Congressman Bell, and I think it is appropriate that we do it at this time, before we proceed to the other project. We are very fond of Congressman Bell up here, and we would be glad to hear any statement which he cares to make at this time.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I shall make a very short statement.

These projects were in my platform down there, and I sure want to carry it out. They are really needed, and are really necessary down there. I have observed the situation myself, and we have all of the engineering data here. If you can go further in the Federal contribution than the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, I would appreciate it, of course, and I think we can get the job done.

All of the local money is available, and we are ready to go on it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MURRAY. Gentlemen, I notice in your brief that the city of Corpus Christi's portion of this project is dependent on an election to be held May 21, 1955; is that correct?

Judge YOUNG. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. MURRAY. What would be the obligation of the city, or how would the city raise its funds in the event of an unfavorable reception by the voters of the city on the bond issue?

Judge YOUNG. Sir, that is not going to happen, but if it should happen, the funds would be made up somewhere else to the extent of about $700,000, and I will tell you that right now.

We would not let that project fail for the lack of $700,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. Actually, we already have the funds. We had a bond issue to the extent of about $22 million a year ago last February, and in that bond issue we had some $800,000 voted for rights-of-way for highways, at not specified locations. Of course, we want this bond issue to pass, and to build this project with bonds voted for that purpose, but if not, we already have the money.

Mr. MURRAY. Can the city legally bind itself for the payment of those bonds under your law, if the election result on the bond issue for the particular project was adverse?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a question which our attorneys will have to answer.

Mr. SMITH. I have asked our legal departments that question, and it has been answered affirmatively that we can, because these were undesignated rights-of-way funds.

Mr. ANDERSON. Actually, the position of the city on this would be for rights-of-way, anyway, and the work shown in the upper connection, and that red line across there, is the part which the city would have to do, anyway.

Mr. MURRAY. I would appreciate receiving the returns of that election, if they can be made available within the next week or so.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; they can be.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not know if the committee cares for that information, but I would appreciate it for my own interest.

Mr. ORR. We shall be glad to furnish that information to the committee.

Mr. SMITH. The counterpart of this by the county and the navigation district was held on March 17.

Mr. MURRAY. I understood that from the record.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; and it passed by a margin of 12 to 1, and we are not expecting any difficulty with this.

Mr. MURRAY. I would imagine so.

Judge YOUNG. Would you like copies of those results? I have those here if you would be interested in them.

Mr. MURRAY. I would like to see them.

Mr. MILLER. We had planned, Mr. Murray, to submit to the committee that information as to the May 21 bond election, the moment that it passed.

(Discussion off the record.)

TULE LAKE CHANNEL EXTENSION

Mr. EVINS. We shall now hear from those of you who will make the presentation in regard to the Tule Lake channel extension.

Mr. MILLER. The Tule Lake extension of Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway is the next project, and Mr. Orr will present that, briefly.

I think it would be helpful if we got out the map again.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed, Mr. Orr.

Mr. ORR. Mr. Chairman, I am district engineer for the Nueces County Navigation District, which is the public body in the county charged with the responsibility of waterway projects.

The project on which we are here today is shown in green on this map here, extending from Avery Point turning basin to the Tule Lake turning basin, a distance of about 4.5 miles.

This includes the turning basin at the upper end.

This project has been authorized for a number of years. However, for one reason or another, the Federal Government did not make an initial appropriation until last year.

The first appropriation on this project of $400,000 was made last year. Since that time, the Corps of Engineers has let a continuing contract which, if additional funds are voted this year, will be used by the Corps of Engineers in continuing this contract until the sum of last year's appropriation, plus this year's appropriation, is spent there.

As I mentioned before, there was $400,000 appropriated last year, and the Bureau of the Budget has recommended $600,000 this year with which to continue the project. The sum of $1 million will, under the present bids, carry the project up to this vicinity [indicating].

It will require an additional appropriation the following year to finish a short stretch of the channel and the turning basin at the upper end of the project.

This will be a 34-foot depth project, by 200 feet bottom width.

The project is vitally needed, and you will notice on the map there the numerous industries which have located on the channel, and others are planning to locate there, as soon as the project is a little further along.

We feel that it is amply justified, and that you gentlemen should continue this appropriation for another year so that the project may be continued; and within a year or a year and a half from now we can see it completed, and placed in operation, as an extension of the important Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway.

Mr. EVINS. What is the name of this river which is marked in blue?

Mr. ORR. That is the Nueces River. We have a request before the Corps of Engineers now for an extension into that area there. That is a large area.

Mr. EVINS. It is planned to extend it on down to the river, then?

Mr. ORR. That is right; we would extend on into that industrial area, there. This [indicating] is a large refinery, and a large tank farm is already located there. In fact, the largest refinery in the area is located at the upper end of the waterway.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to offer for the record our prepared statement on this project at this time.

Mr. EVINS. Without objection, the statement will be incorporated into the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF DUANE ORR, DISTRICT ENGINEER, NUECES COUNTY NAVIGATION DISTRICT NO. 1, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, my name is Duane Orr and I am district engineer for Nueces County Navigation District No. 1, in whose district the Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway is located. I appear before

you today in support of the Bureau of Budget's recommendation that $600,000 be appropriated this year to continue dredging the important Tule Lake Channel extension of the Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway.

During the last session, Congress appropriated $400,000 to commence dredging of the channel extension. Since then, the Corps of Engineers have awarded a continuing contract for dredging all of the channel within the limits of the project, but not the Tule Lake turning basin. Payment for the work performed under the present contract will be made from funds already appropriated, and from funds which may be appropriated by Congress during this session.

The $400,000 previously appropriated is sufficient to continue the work until the end of the present fiscal year. However, the additional $600,000 requested will be needed early in the next fiscal year to keep the contractor at work.

AVAILABILITY OF SITES ON DEEP WATER

Completion of this project is urgently needed to provide additional sites on deep water for further industrial expansion in the Corpus Christi area. It will be noted from the aerial photograph of the present harbor, on the preceding page, that most of the available frontage on deep water is already occupied by docks. Even this recent photograph does not give the full story, because plans are now being prepared for 6 additional docks on the undeveloped frontage, 5 of which are scheduled to be constructed during the next 12 months. Upon completion of these docks, 86 percent of the available deep-water frontage within the main harbor will be occupied by docks. The remaining frontage will provide space for only 3 deep-sea docks and 2 barge docks. All of these locations, except one, are not desirable sites. The more desirable sites are on the authorized Tule Lake Channel extension.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE CHANNEL EXTENSION

The Tule Lake Channel extension has been authorized for several years, but because of various restrictions Congress never appropriated any funds for its construction until last year. The project was originally authorized by Congress in 1938 (H. Doc. 574, 75th Cong., 3d sess.) as a 32- by 150-foot project. However, the project was later modified by increasing the authorized bottom width to 200 feet and the depth to 34 feet (H. Doc. 544, 78th Cong., 2d sess.). In 1948 the project depth was increased to 36 feet to correspond with the authorized depth of the other sections of the Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (H. Doc. 560, 80th Cong., 2d sess.).

EXISTING BARGE CANAL ON THE AUTHORIZED CHANNEL ALINEMENT

In 1948, as an inducement for Corn Products Refining Co. to locate at Corpus Christi, the navigation district dredged an 18- by 100-foot barge channed 3¼ miles long along the alinement of the authorized Tule Lake Channel extension to the Corn Products plant. This barge canal, which was dredged at a total cost of $332,484.12, now has 4 docks, serving 4 different companies, located on it.

EXISTING DOCKS AND FACILITIES ON THE AUTHORIZED CHANNEL

The dock of American Smelting & Refining Co., located on the south side of the canal, is used to load barges with sulphuric acid. Public Oil Dock No. 6, which is owned by the navigation district, is used by Corpus Christi Refining Co. to load and unload petroleum and petroleum products. A third slip and dock has recently been constructed by Heldenfels Bros., local material dealers, and is used to unload mud shell for the companies hot mix asphalt plant.

Consolidated Shipyard Co., Inc., have completed the construction of the first unit of a shipyard located on the north side of the channel. This company is engaged in building and repairing tugs and barges and other marine equipment, and it has plans to enlarge it's operation to include voyage repair on deep sea vessels as soon as the deep water channel is completed past their yard.

A fifth company, Magnet Cove Barium Corp., has leased a site on the north side of the Tule Lake Channel extension and is developing it for processing and storing drilling mud used in offshore drilling operations. A slip for the dock has been dredged and it is anticipated that the dock will be constructed within the next 6 months. Several other industrial plants are located along the pro-

posed channel, but these companies as yet have not built docks. (See Exhibit 3, Industrial District Map, Port of Corpus Christi, M–2–2 (19).)

INDUSTRIES LOCATED ALONG THE AUTHORIZED CHANNEL

Corn Products Refining Co. plant is one of the companies which is located on the authorized Tule Lake Channel extension that does not have a dock. The plant was located at Corpus Christi because of the abundance of milo maize grown within a radius of 75 miles of Corpus Christi, and the need for a plant on tidewater to manufacture food products for exporting to England. It is estimated that savings in transportation costs in excess of $50,000 annually will be realized on export tonnage alone when the deep water channel is completed past the plant, thus permitting the products to move directly to shipside by conveyors after packaging, instead of first being stored at the plant, later loaded into boxcars, switched to the public docks, and unloaded onto the docks.

A survey made by officials of the company indicated that over 31,200 tons of products, principally gluten, can be shipped by coastwise vessels from Corpus Christi and distributed on the eastern seaboard in competition with companies located in the East, provided deepwater transportation is available at the plant side. The moving of 31,200 tons per year directly from the plant by ship represents an additional annual saving in transportation costs of $88,233 over moving the same tonnage by rail to the present public docks and loading the cargo aboard vessels there.

The Corpus Christi Refining Co.'s refinery is located on the authorized project 2 miles west of the Avery Point turning basin. This refinery is capable of processing 8,700 barrels of crude per day, or 415,000 tons annually. Officials of the company have estimated that 100,000 tons will move by barge and 115,000 tons by tanker annually. The annual saving in transportation costs on 115,000 tons loaded aboard tanker at a dock 800 feet from the plant, as compared to pumping the products 2½ miles to deep water, is estimated at $38,330.

The American Smelting & Refining Co. plant is also located on the proposed deepwater channel about 2½ miles west of the Avery Point Basin. This plant produces zinc by the electrolysis process with sulfuric acid as the major byproduct. The original plant roasts 91,000 short tons of ore annually, and produces 42,000 short tons of zinc and 67,200 tons of sulfuric acid. An expansion program was completed last year which increased the zinc production by 24,000 short tons annually, and, if necessary, the new plant can be expanded within a short time, and the zinc production increased another 24,000 tons annually.

The plant was originally designed to process ore received from Newfoundland, but the menace of submarines in the Atlantic prevented the company from carrying out this plan. However, to produce the zinc vitally needed in the war effort, the company switched to the use of ores received by rail from the Republic of Mexico, and the company has continued to use Mexican ores until recently. The plant is now beginning to receive ores by ship from foreign countries. The company is receiving ores through the port of Corpus Christi for the Amarillo and El Paso plants in addition to the local plant. It is too early to predict the eventual outcome of this foreign import program, however, it is reasonable to expect that with a deepwater channel alongside the property, the company will give serious consideration to constructing its own ore unloading dock.

Columbia Southern Corp. owns a large tract of land fronting on the authorized Tule Lake deepwater project, which it acquired as a site for future expansion of its present plant, or the construction of a plant by one of the affiliated companies. The company contemplates filling the property, in anticipation of using it after the fill has consolidated.

For several years Fordyce Gravel Co. has owned a site on the authorized deepwater channel, and it is expected that the company will develop the property once the channel has been dredged to project dimensions.

The Suntide Refining Co. has constructed the largest refinery in the Corpus Christi area under certificate of necessity TA–NC–21313. This plant is located 1¾ miles west of the westerly end of the authorized Tule Lake extension. The refinery, which consists of a crude and vacuum unit, catalytic cracking unit, concentration unit, hydrofloric acid alkalation unit, phosphoric acid polymerization unit and complete utilities, processes between 30,000 and 35,000 barrels of

crude per day. Officials of the company estimate the following tonnage will move by water per year:

Products	*Tons per year*
Gasoline (regular, premium, and aviation)	660,650
Heating oil and diesel fuel	381,425
Jet fuel	250,755
Bunker C fuel	127,750
Total tons per year	1,420,580

It is estimated that a savings of $0.30 per ton can be realized in loading tankers at the Tule Lake Basin instead of pumping the products 8¾ miles and loading tankers at one of the present docks. Based on this estimate, the loading of tankers at the Tule Lake Basin represents an annual saving of $426,000 in transportation costs over the present method of loading the ships.

A second certificate of necessity, which would approximately double the capacity of the plant, has been received by the company, but as yet it has not begun construction of the second unit. It is estimated that the second unit will increase petroleum shipments by at least 1 million tons per year.

North American Petroleum Co. and W. K. Holt Co. have each recently acquired tracts of land near the westerly end of the authorized Tule Lake Channel extension for industrial development. One company has advised the district that the two companies intend to develop both tracts together. The petroleum company plans to begin construction of its plant in June of this year. (See exhibit 2, letter of NAPCO, dated May 5, 1955.) In the initial operation, the company proposes to run 10,000 barrels of crude per day, however, in 2 years, they expect to be running 20,000 barrels per day. It is estimated that half of the products from the refinery will move by water.

Heldenfels Bros., a local contractor and building materials dealer, owns a 275-acre tract with frontage on the Tule Lake channel, which they plan to develop into small industrial sites in the near future. The company has a hot-mix plant in operation on the site and has dredged a slip and constructed a bulkhead on the canal for handling construction materials received by water.

Humble Pipeline Co. has a large crude oil tank farm located near the Suntide refinery and not far from the authorized Tule Lake turning basin. Crude from both west and south Texas is received at this terminal, however, no estimate is available of the tonnage that the company might move by water after the deepwater channel is completed.

ESTIMATED SAVINGS IN TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Shown below is the estimated annual savings in transportation costs that will be realized once the Tule Lake Channel extension is completed and the industries located along it begin using the channel.

Name of company	*Savings*
Corn Products Refining Co	$137,070
North American Petroleum Corp	56,250
Corpus Christi Refining Co	33,530
Suntide Refining Co	726,000
Estimated annual savings	952,850

The estimated annual savings in transportation costs total $952,850 as compared to an annual Federal cost of less than $100,000 to dredge and maintain the channel. This favorable ratio of better than 9 to 1 is ample justification for the Federal Government's dredging and maintaining the Tule Lake Channel extension to project dimensions.

CONCUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The tonnages produced by the industries located along the authorized Tule Lake extension is sufficient justification for Congress appropriating the funds recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for continuing work on the project. We respectfully urge that you give favorable consideration to the recommendation that $600,000 be appropriated this year to continue dredging on the Tule Lake extension of the Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway.

EXHIBIT 2

NORTH AMERICAN PETROLEUM CORP., NAPCO,
Corpus Christi, Tex., May 5, 1955.

NUECES COUNTY NAVIGATION DISTRICT,
Gugenheim-Cohn Building, Corpus Christi, Tex.

(Attention: Mr. Duane Orr.)

DEAR MR. ORR: Concerning our several conversations this is to confirm that North American Petroleum Corp. is purchasing the 60-acre tract of land located on Upriver Road, for the construction of a petroleum refinery.

We have been negotiating for this particular site since the later part of 1953, primarily because we have been advised and more or less assured that the proposed deepwater ship channel would pass by our property.

Our plan for construction is progressing, whereas we are hopeful to begin construction by early June of this year.

When our initial plant is in operation we anticipate the handling of some 10,000 barrels per day, along the same line within 2 years of operation we anticipate 20,000 barrels per day of raw, semirefined, and refined petroleum products.

We anticipate the use of the ship channel for both barge and oceangoing vessels transportation and eventually propose to construct our own docks. It is with this water transportation facilities in mind that we paid a considerable higher price for the property in question than we would have otherwise.

Therefore, it is imperative to our present and future plans for the construction and growth of our refinery and facilities, that the proposed ship channel progresses as rapidly as possible.

We are certain that the facilities of the navigation in the entire Corpus Christi area will benefit greatly now and for many future years by the proposed channel and turning basin.

Very truly yours,

V. VERMILYEA, *Vice President.*

Mr. MILLER. That will conclude our testimony, Mr. Chairman. We will appreciate the earnest consideration of the committee in regard to these projects.

Mr. EVINS. Do you have any further statement, Congressman Bell?

Mr. BELL. No; I have no further general statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell you this much: We surely do thank you for your kind and courteous attention which you have given to our group here today.

Mr. EVINS. You have all made fine statements. You have given a general overall fine presentation and we have been pleased to hear you. I have been in your town of Corpus Christi and it is a good town.

CHETCO PROJECT

Mr. EVINS. Before we hear the next witness, I will insert into the record a statement by Mr. Ed F. Ackley in regard to the Chetco River project, Oregon.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT RE CHETCO PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

The Chetco River rises in the coast range and flows approximately 30 miles through Curry County, Oreg. Its mouth is located on the boundary of the city of Brookings and the Pacific Ocean. The river flows into the ocean at a point approximately 6 miles north of the California and Oregon State line.

Approximately one-half mile northerly from this last named point the continental shore line swings toward the east. This shoreline is marked by high cliffs which act as a break against the prevailing westerly and northwesterly winds over the ocean. The area of water resulting from this swing of the conti-

nental shoreline is called Pelican Bay. As the result of all of this, for approximately 2 miles out from the mouth of the Chetco River, there is smooth water. The usual offshore surge and roll of the ocean, peculiar to much of the shoreline of the Oregon coast, does not occur at the mouth of the Chetco River.

We respectfully show your committee that, north of Monterey Bay in the State of California, there is no place on the west coast that lends itself so favorably to the purpose that we here respectfully propose. As a matter of fact there is no other place on the west coast which can be adapted to a similar purpose.

Prior to World War No. II, the development of the mouth of the Chetco River was offered, approved and recommended to Congress by the Corps of Army Engineers. Since that time it has remained dormant before Congress.

At the time of the initial recommendation to Congress, southern Curry County, Oreg., the area surrounding this proposed development, was a thinly settled area, and actually, one of the last frontiers of the Nation.

Today people from all corners of the country are here taking up their respective residences. The city of Brookings does not appear on the last Federal census. Today it is an incorporated city of approximately 3,000 population. Surrounding the city are approximately 2,000 other residents. This area is approximately 15 miles in length along the Pacific Ocean and is located on benches which drift back, a distance of approximately 2 miles, to the mountains. It possesses one of the finest climates in America. The Weather Bureau has a station here. Occasionally in the months of January and February our high daily temperature is the highest in the United States. We seldom have snow and never have ice, other than in an occasional nominal amount, which is quickly dissipated. In the winter it is warm and in the summer it is cool. We seldom have a temperature in excess of 80 degrees or under 40 degrees. Flowers bloom here the year round. The area extends along United States Highway 101 which runs north, along the Pacific Coast. from San Francisco. It is located approximately half way between San Francisco, Calif., and Portland, Oreg.

THE CHETCO DEVELOPMENT

1. This development as suggested and approved by the Corps of United States Army Engineers calls for, in part, the erection of a jetty at the mouth of the Chetco River. In its original recommendation the Army engineers set forth as necessary to complete the proposed development the sum of approximately $180,000. The people of this area agree to provide, at their cost, sufficient rock quarries from which to supply the necessary rock for the jetties.

2. After this proposed improvement has been constructed, a commercial and sports fishing boat, and small ocean-going craft haven can be established on the river basin for use by the public. The Coast Guard could use this haven as a base. It could further be developed into a submarine base. And, as above stated, there is no place along the Pacific coastline that would more readily adapt itself to such purposes. If this project could be accomplished, this area could be made into one of the most pleasant recreational areas in the country without cost to the Federal Government.

JUSTIFICATION OF THE EXPENSE

1. Offshore from the mouth of the Chetco River is one of the best fishing areas on the west coast. This fishing area extends for some 20 miles along the coastline. Here salmon, halibut, tuna, ling cod, sea bass and many other species of fish may be caught in abundance. Here are great banks of crab and abalone water.

2. Hundreds of commercial fishing craft now ply these waters. Due to the distance from, and the difficulty in getting to, a port at which to discharge their cargoes, commercial fishing is serious handicapped.

3. Sports fishermen now arrive in large numbers and launch their boats upon the ocean and are fishing offshore. These people come from all over the United States. All of them have heard about the sport to be had offshore from the mouth of the Chetco River and are determined to have a part of it. Most of these people come from inland areas of this country and have had little, if any, experience with ocean conditions. As they launch their boats from the shore under the present primitive conditions, they either seem to forget or do not realize the hazards and the perils of their venture. As a further result of their enthusiasm, some of them have been drowned. Construction of the proposed development would result in the saving of human life

and greatly diminish the perils which surround these people under present conditions.

4. Provided this development were completed, the commercial fishingmen could have a readily accessible place, at any time of the year, at which to discharge their respective cargoes. They would establish canneries upon the banks of the river with the result that a greater supply of canned fish would be available in our markets.

5. Provided this development was created, safe sports fishing boats would transport fishermen out onto the ocean and offer unsurpassed fishing and recreation. This would be available at slight cost to the thousands of tourists who travel over United States Highway 101. The recreational area which could be built upon this development could be maintained by the State of Oregon from additional taxes which would be received from and paid by the commercial fishermen. The Federal Government would not be requested to contribute any sum of money toward the maintenance of this recreational area.

6. It would afford a harbor easily accessible at any time of the year for use by the Government for its Coast Guard craft.

7. This development would enhance the national income. Canneries, warehouses, boat works, machine shops and fuel stations would be built and from the operation thereof many people would make a living.

8. The intangible benefits to be derived from this development are beyond any estimation of dollars and cents. Thousands of people from all of our States now come to this area for recreation. Located upon one of the Nation's better known highways, it is easily accessible to everyone. It is a green land of giant firs and redwoods, encompassed by scenery with breath-taking views, bounded by the Pacific Ocean in its peaceful ebb and flow, inhabited by a kind and hospitable people. Please do not believe that we here exaggerate the potentialities of this area, but, rather, we understate and underestimate the many benefits to be attained from this proposed development.

We honestly and sincerely conclude by saying that, if you gentlemen of Congress will approve of and appropriate for this project and thereafter come out here and view the results of your action, there shall be no doubts in your minds relative to the integrity of the above statement which we here respectfully offer to you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted.

ED F. ACKLEY.

MAY 12, 1955.

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1955.

ROCKY REACH—COLUMBIA RIVER

WITNESS

HON. WALT HORAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear next our colleague, Walt Horan, who is a great friend and a great Congressman. We will be pleased to hear you, Mr. Horan, at this time.

Mr. HORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that what I contribute will not be repetitious of the testimony you have heard. If it is, I trust the subcommittee will forgive me, and I would like to ask Colonel Whipple to supplement anything I say.

Mr. EVINS. We will give you the privilege of cross-examining Colonel Whipple.

Mr. HORAN. Well, he is a very dear friend of mine and I hope that will not be necessary.

What we are considering here, as you know, actually is the stretch of the Columbia River above the reservoir formed by the Rock Island

Dam, which is presently owned by the Chelan County Public Utility District. That is my home county.

Mr. EVINS. We are told that Wenatchee is a great public-power area and a great area for apples and other fruits, too.

Mr. HORAN. We do think that we have a very intelligent and forward-looking population there.

Mr. HAND. It proves that by the returns from the election.

Mr. HORAN. Thank you.

We do appreciate the fact that we have lived beside this river from time immemorial and we have seen literally billions of dollars of values go down the river in the absence of dams to utilize the power capability as reflected in this water.

Chief Joseph Dam is being built now by the Army engineers and it is quite a monument to the efficiency of Charles Wagner, the resident engineer. At the time this dam was originally estimated for, the cost was placed at $225 million. It will be actually completed for an outlay of about $170 million, which indicates the full use of all of the natural possibilities connected with Chief Joseph Dam have been utilized.

We are very proud of that, and also the fact that the Army engineers have seen fit to promote Charles Wagner, as the resident engineer, to the Seattle office. He is a great man and a great dam builder.

The Columbia River Falls—I believe I am correct in this, Colonel Whipple, nearly 150 feet—is that not about true—from the tail race of Chief Joseph Dam to the head of the reservoir formed by the Rock Island Dam?

Colonel WHIPPLE. It is about 140 feet.

Mr. HORAN. About 140 feet. This reach of the river was included in the Army's 308 report of 1925. However, only cursory examinations were made, and at that time they suggested that there was a good site for a dam here [indicating] in a rather wide section of the river known as Rocky Reach. And on the face of it, it looked like the type of dam that could be built with a dam across the river, and the same type of estuary and powerplant which we have at Chief Joseph. This would warp the river around a huge rock extending over on the eastern side of the river, and allow the powerplant to be put at a right angle to the dam.

However, the Chelan County Public Utility District has a license on this and has already employed Stone & Webster Corp. to make seismographic studies and they have found the bedrock at that particular point is so far under a lot of rubble and dirt that the cost of moving the dirt to get down to bedrock would be prohibitive, something like $30 million—at least that is the estimate; and so Chelan County Public Utility District has employed Stone & Webster, and they have made this seismographic study of the river at this point, and they have found that by going down the river some 2 miles, that in the vicinity of what is known as Lincoln Rock, where there is an astounding life-like profile of Abraham Lincoln in what is known as the Swankane Canyon and in that vicinity they find bedrock practically, well, very close to the soil, and it is estimated there will probably be a great savings over the original estimate for Rocky Reach.

However, since this has never been studied in detail, the borings, and since we do not know what the Federal interest is in this stretch of the river, we have this supplemental now to enable the Army engineers to complete their work on the Columbia River and determine what the Federal interests are.

I might say that the Chelan County Public Utility District is ready and prepared to proceed with this construction of the dam at Rocky Reach. However, we do feel that the Army engineers should make the study and should make their determination as to what the Federal interests are, what the values are that might be nonreimbursable; that is, such as navigation, together with studies that the Chelan County Public Utility District is making already concerning fish and wildlife and also the reclamation and other features that might be had in connection with this stretch of the river.

We do not know, until the Army engineers have completed their study, whether we will want 1, 2, or 3 dams. It may be that it will be found feasible to put 3 dams in here; it may be found that we want 1 rather high head dam at the Rocky Reach area and none upstream. That is to be determined by these proposed studies.

I might say that Douglas County has also filed on a site here some miles north, known as Wells, which would be right at this point [indicating], and we need the study to enable these two public utility districts, Chelan County and Douglas County, to know exactly where they are and to know exactly what the nature of the stream is, and to know exactly what the Federal interest in this is, so that these counties can go ahead with the proposed construction of these dams.

I can say that there will be no difficulty to finance the construction of these dams; that is tentatively arranged for at the present time; but we do feel that, since there are these interests, and since this is an international river, and since the Army engineers have done such an outstanding piece of work on this river, we would like to have this study made.

Mr. EVINS. That is very interesting testimony, Mr. Horan. I have just a few questions for edification.

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. How far distant is it by river from Grand Coulee to Chief Joseph?

Mr. HORAN. Fifty-two miles, I believe; is that not right, Colonel Whipple? That is from the tail race of Grand Coulee Dam to the Chief Joseph structure.

Mr. EVINS. How far is it from Chief Joseph to the Chelan County Rock Island Dam?

Mr. HORAN. To the headwaters of the reach above——

Mr. EVINS (interposing). To the dam.

Mr. HORAN. To the dam?

Mr. EVINS. Yes; Chief Joseph Dam down to Rock Island Dam.

Mr. HORAN. It is in excess of 60 miles. Have you got the exact figures?

Colonel WHIPPLE. I do not have the exact mileage.

Mr. HORAN. It is in excess of 60 miles from here [indicating] as the river flows.

Mr. EVINS. It looks as though the map would show it twice as far, from Chief Joseph to Grand Coulee, say 100 miles.

Mr. HORAN. No.

Mr. EVINS. You say it is about 52 miles?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; I am sorry I do not have the exact mileage.

Mr. EVINS. And you say the other is about 60?

Mr. HORAN. No; I think I had better check that. I would like to supply that for the record, because if this is 52 [indicating] this other would have to be in the neighborhood of 90, I would think.

Mr. EVINS. How far is it from Chief Joseph to the headwaters of the impounded waters at Rock Island?

Mr. HORAN. That comes up to about here [indicating]. This indicated in green here is my home; and we sold flood rights on the river there, and that takes up to 634. What is the elevation of Chief Joseph, Colonel Whipple? They have flood rights up to an elevation of 634 feet above sea level.

Colonel WHIPPLE. The elevation at Chief Joseph is 946.

Mr. HORAN. 946. Then we have got something like 140 feet difference.

Colonel WHIPPLE. That is the maximum.

Mr. HORAN. The maximum.

Colonel WHIPPLE. To the upper pool, and then, as you say, the tail water is somewhere below 800 at Chief Joseph Dam.

Mr. EVINS. The Chelan Public Power District owns, as I understand it, the Rock Island Dam?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. Would they interpose objection? I am trying to determine, on a mileage basis, how far do their rights go.

Mr. HORAN. This is 634 feet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Would they interpose an objection to building there?

Mr. HORAN. No, they could not. Their right to raise the water is stopped at 634 feet above sea level.

Mr. EVINS. That is my point. Could you point out again on the map approximately where that elevation is?

Mr. HORAN. About here [indicating]; that would be my guess. Would that not be about right?

Colonel WHIPPLE. Yes; I think it runs about 21 miles up the river.

Mr. HORAN. I would guess about here [indicating].

Mr. EVINS. Anything about 21 miles then would meet no objection by the Chelan Public Power District?

Mr. HORAN. There could not be. The dam has been completed by the Chelan County Public Utilities District. It was originally built as a low-head dam, but 3 years ago they completed it and built the higher structure, so they have the maximum use of the river there.

Mr. EVINS. You say, Mr. Horan, that Stone & Webster was making a survey for the Chelan County District?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; they have employed them to make a study because they were interested in filing; when they filed their right to build at this reach, they were required to do some work.

Mr. EVINS. Chelan County filed?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; and they were required to do some work and so they employed Stone & Webster to make a study of the river at that section. However, it is sort of supplementary and we want the Army engineers to make the study for the entire stretch of the river.

Mr. EVINS. And the funds requested here for this survey would be for the entire river?

Mr. HORAN. Yes, in this particular stretch of the Columbia.

Mr. EVINS. Covering the entire area between Rock Island and Chief Joseph?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; including the Wells site which Douglas County is interested.

Mr. EVINS. The Corps of Engineers is skilled and is capable of doing the job?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; they have done an excellent job out there, and we are very proud of the men in the Corps of Engineers out our way and we feel that they could do a thorough job, but could also do a good economical job.

Mr. EVINS. Regardless of where the future dam site may be located, it is proposed that this dam be a partnership proposition?

Mr. HORAN. Yes, with the Federal Government assuming those values which the Army engineers might determine were strictly Federal.

We have, I might say, one dam here which we would like to have built one of these days, and that is the Libby Dam, which would be strictly Federal. That would not be in any sense a partnership dam.

Mr. EVINS. Who are the private interests that would enter into the partnership here?

Mr. HORAN. None.

Mr. EVINS. It would be with Chelan County?

Mr. HORAN. It is Chelan County entirely.

Mr. EVINS. There would not be an arrangement between so-called private interests and public interests?

Mr. HORAN. No.

Mr. EVINS. And it is your feeling that these funds should be provided forthwith, so that the Army engineers can go ahead and do the work in 1956?

Mr. HORAN. We are very anxious to get started and very anxious for them to build.

Mr. EVINS. You have made a very fine statement.

Mr. HORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Horan.

Mr. HORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have been very kind.

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1955.

PROJECTS IN NEVADA

WITNESS

HON. CLIFTON YOUNG, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. EVINS. We will now hear from our colleague, Congressman Young, of Nevada. I believe that you are interested in Boulder City.

Mr. YOUNG. I am interested in supporting budgetary requests for the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Interior, in their activities in the State of Nevada and the district that I represent.

First, under general investigations appropriation, I would like to support their request for $20,000 to continue reconnaissance studies in the lower Colorado River Basin.

This reconnaissance will take place in the vicinity of Moapa pumping and Mormon Mesa, both of which are critically short of water. The valley has an allocation in Colorado River of some 300,000 acre-feet, but there is a high lift involved. It is not possible to utilize that water with a gravity feed, and we are anxious to see whether or not it would be feasible through reclamation development to eventually put that water to constructive use on our land.

Second, under general investigations, the Bureau was seeking some $66,000 to continue engineering and economic investigations in the vicinity of Las Vegas. They have already submitted a preliminary report and have developed two potential types of reclamation projects there, one using the effluent from the sewage, and the other using water from Lake Mead, not for agricultural purposes, but industrial, municipal, and domestic uses.

This sum is necessary to continue the investigations which they have already developed to see whether or not any plan ultimately would be feasible.

With regard to Boulder Canyon project, I would like to support their request, first for the Hoover powerplant in connection with the procurement of equipment for a generating unit known as N-8. That would be the last generating unit to be installed there. It has been programed for several years. Developments have been held up because of some sort of dispute between Nevada and California, but I think that has been resolved and they are now ready to proceed

There is an item of $130,000 for a switchyard, installation of a transformer bank, and this is an obligation resulting from an existing contract.

There is another item for general property, $140,000; and $100,000 of that is for the installation of a sewage-disposal plant at Hoover Dam. This is a serious deficiency. There are nearly 2 million visitors a year to the Lake Mead recreation area at the present time. Strangely enough, when the dam was planned there was no provision made for disposing of the sewage.

Directly below Hoover Dam is Lake Mojave. It is a rather attractive, elongated lake, which is becoming a recreational center, and the sewage from the dam is dumped into Lake Mojave. About a third of the people who visit the recreational area go through the Hoover Dam and the equivalent of a city of about 1,500 would produce the same amount of affluent and sewage which is now dumped into Lake Mojave. It has been criticized by both the State health commissions of Nevada and Arizona, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have conducted investigations and have found that a health menace exists there.

I am hopeful that the committee will see fit to approve the Secretary's request to allow the installation of a sewage-disposal plant at Hoover Dam.

Over at Boulder City, which is a part of the project, they are having difficulty with their sewage-disposal plant, too. I have checked there several times during the past year, and the odors from the plant are detectable from the city. They are seeking $50,000 to further rehabilitate and improve these conditions.

At Boulder City there is $519,000 being requested for the operation and maintenance of the city in the field of utility management and municipal facilities. I know that roads and highways are badly in need of repair.

The committee will perhaps be interested to know that a congressional hearing will be conducted starting next Tuesday and Wednesday in Boulder City on legislation which is designed to enable the Government to withdraw from the task of operating the city and to allow the Government to discontinue its real-estate business there

The bill, which has been endorsed by the Appropriations Committees in the past, will enable the Government in charge to get out of the business of operating Boulder City.

I am hopeful if such occurs we will no longer impose upon your time here requesting appropriations each year to operate.

Mr. EVINS. We thank you very much.

The committee will stand adjourned.

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955.

FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CITY OF MONTEZUMA, MACON COUNTY, GA.

WITNESS

HON. E. L. FORRESTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. EVINS. The committee will hear Congressman E. L. Forrester of Georgia. Mr. Forrester is a very able Representative from the State of Georgia and a member of the important Judiciary Committee and our friend and we are certainly very glad to hear him.

Mr. FORRESTER. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the opportunity of appearing before this committee.

For the record, I will identify myself. I am E. L. Forrester, Congressman from the Third District of Georgia.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you are rushed for time. I assure you that I do not intend to take up much of your time.

I have a short statement, following which I may have a few comments to make and then I would like for the gentlemen of this committee to ask me any questions that they would think pertinent.

Mr. EVINS. You may proceed as you wish.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in a flood-control project for the protection of the citizens of the city of Montezuma, Macon County, Ga., arising out of that certain navigable stream known as the Flint River, which has a habit during heavy rainy seasons of inundating a large portion of the business section of that city.

I have taken this matter up with the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, asking that this project be handled under the general authority of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act. That act permits $150,000 to be expended on a project upon a finding of the Chief of Engineers that such project is necessary. Beginning in 1952, the engineers have interested themselves in this project, and the Chief of Engineers advised me that they have a plan for construction which has been considered satisfactory by his reviewing authorities. His

report states that the total cost of the construction recommended would be $207,000, of which $150,000 would necessarily be the Federal portion under authority of section 212 above referred to. The city of Montezuma has agreed to pay the additional sum of $57,000, so that the cost to the Government would be $150,000.

I am requesting that a letter from Gen. E. C. Itschner, dated October 28, 1954, which enumerates the cost and says that the construction plan has been approved be made a part of the record. Also, copy of a letter from the Chief of Engineers to me, dated February 16, 1955, advising me that it was impossible to say whether this project could be financed in the fiscal year 1956 through funds allotted section 212. The general stated that plans have been developed and full project review accomplished for 7 projects, and additionally, they were studying 5 additional projects apparently justified and needed. That the estimated Federal cost of the 7 developed projects is slightly over $1 million, while the President's 1956 budget includes only $600,000 for spending on section 212 of the Flood Control Act. A copy of that letter from General Itschner is attached.

The purpose of my appearance before your subcommittee today is to urge that your committee recommend that, at least, $1 million be appropriated for the fiscal year 1956 budget for obligation under the authority of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act. The amount asked for is modest, indeed. The project that I am interested in is one that is of imperative necessity. The people of Montezuma are willing and anxious to contribute to this project as set out above and will vote bonds for that purpose immediately upon being notified that the Government will expend $150,000 thereon.

This project simply cannot wait. It would be bad for that city to be flooded again by a navigable river when the situation can be so easily remedied by a most modest sum being applied thereto.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, sir.

The letters you referred to will be incorporated in the record as you requested.

(The letters are as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington 25, D. C., October 28, 1954.

Hon. E. L. FORRESTER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORRESTER: Reference is made to your letter dated October 20, 1954, in which you requested that you be furnished information on the status of the report prepared by the district engineer at Mobile, Ala., on the flood problem at Montezuma, Ga. Information in this regard is furnished herein.

The report of the district engineer proposes a program of levee construction along the right bank of Beaver Creek where the channel of that stream is adjacent to the town of Montezuma. The proposed levee system would be supplemented with interior drainage facilities consisting of a pumping plant and appurtenant works, and would also include facilities for the provision of emergency closures of the two railroad crossings during periods of extreme high water. The report recommends construction of the project at an estimated total cost of $207,000, of which $150,000 would be the Federal portion. The town of Montezuma would be required to furnish certain assurances of local cooperation, including participation in the project at an estimated cost of $57,000.

A review of the proposed plan of construction has been made by the division engineer at Atlanta, Ga., and by this office. The plan is considered satisfactory by both reviewing authorities. However, as all funds available to this office for the accomplishment of small local protection projects under the authority of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act have been allocated, the formal approval to initiate construction will have to be deferred until adequate appropriations

become available. In this connection, fiscal year 1955 appropriations for work under the above noted authority amounted to only $300,000, or enough for Federal participation in only 2 projects the size of the 1 planned at Montezuma. This situation has resulted in the formation of a fairly large backlog of proposed projects on which favorable reports have been received. It will therefore be necessary to reserve any definite decision in the Montezuma case until the amount of funds to be made available for fiscal year 1956 is known. As soon as additional funds are appropriated, it is proposed to reexamine the backlog of favorable reports with a view to approving as many as practicable within the limit of the appropriated amount with preference being given to those of greatest overall merit. You may be assured that the Montezuma project is considered a meritorious one and will receive, at that time, full consideration along with the other projects which have been found eligible for construction.

I trust that the above information will be sufficient for your needs at this time. Should you desire additional information please feel free to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

WM. WHIPPLE,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
(For E. C. Itschner, Brigadier General, United States Army, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works).

FEBRUARY 16, 1955.

Hon. E. L. FORRESTER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORRESTER: Reference is made to your letter of January 20, 1955, in which you asked for information concerning the proposed local protection project for Montezuma, Ga.

As you know, projects of the type of that proposed for Montezuma are selected under the general authority of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act. As stated in our letter of October 29, 1954, funds available through fiscal year 1955 for allocation to this type of work have been exhausted. Our present unfinanced backlog of justified projects, for which plans have been developed and full project review accomplished, now totals seven. In addition, we have under study at the present time five additional projects apparently justified and needed.

The estimated Federal cost of the 7 fully developed projects is slightly over $1 million, and of the 5 additional projects approximately $800,000. Contrasted with this amount, the President's fiscal year 1956 budget includes only $600,000 for obligation under the authority of section 212 of the 1950 Flood Control Act.

In view of this situation, I consider that the only fair approach is to delay final selection of further projects to be financed until the Appropriation Act of fiscal year 1956 is passed. At that time I shall analyze all the projects whose review is complete and for which plans are ready, and allocate to those projects most needed and justified the funds made available. This procedure, incidentally, is the one we have followed in other recent years when a substantial backlog of projects existed.

I am fully aware of the requirement for flood protection at Montezuma, and of the need of the city to have maximum advance information. In view of all the above, however, I am unable to state specifically whether or not this project can be financed in fiscal year 1956. You may be assured, however, that I shall notify you and the city as soon as funds can be committed definitely to this work.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Brigadier General United States Army,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

Mr. FORRESTER. Now, Mr. Chairman, right or wrong, when I came to Congress that is the way I proceeded. I tried to get something done for those people down there under that Flood Control Act. As I say, this project has already been declared as one that is necessary and one that can be done for the modest sum of $207,000. To me, it is somewhat refreshing that although this is a navigable river and this matter is one that responsibility is upon the Federal Government, that the people of that city, and it is a small city, it is about

3,500 people, that they are willing to vote bonds and pay that sum of $57,000 in order to get this work started.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is happening to those people down there is every time we have a rainy season the water comes from Flint River and backs over into the town and it causes untold damage to the business section of that little town. Now, I am impressed in this matter because this is one that is not the result of high pressure. This is one, Mr. Chairman, that the engineers of the United States say that this is expedient and something that should be done. To tell you the truth, you gentlemen may from your experience have some reasons that I am unaware of, but I cannot but think that this is one of the finest ways you can proceed in matters of this kind. There are no politics in it.

The Engineering Department has to appraise these things and say when they should be done or whether they should not be done and I am glad that I can come before you in that manner and tell you that this project has been approved.

Now, they are struggling along. They have sound projects. That is they say they have seven sound projects. I don't know anything about those projects but I apprehend that every one of those are all right because the Corps of Engineers says they are all right.

Now, your budget only provides $600,000 for work of that kind which I think in the very nature of things are bound to be work that is deserving, having met the schedules and the policies of the Chief of Engineers. I want to hasten to say to you that the Chief of Engineers does not know that I am appearing before you today. I am taking this up on my own volition. It did occur to me, though, that if you could put $400,000 more into this appropriation for section 212 of the Flood Control Act, you would get 7 projects that have been under scrutiny and met the approval of the Corps of Engineers.

I might have dropped a bill into the basket and might have gotten the bill passed for the entire $207,000, but under present conditions, people down there realize that the danger is so acute and so real that with the present administration down there, the mayor and common council, there will be no difficulty in voting those bonds and getting that $57,000 and putting it into the pot and relieving the Federal Government of that amount.

As I say, if you could give that modest sum of $1 million, you would have 7 projects, but realizing how badly the people down there need it I would like to see some provision made for this small project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Forrester, for a very fine statement, a very forceful statement. You are most persuasive in the matters that you advocate.

We know that the funds, the so-called section 212 funds, may be used by the Corps of Engineers on projects which they approve. Your project, as I understand it, has been approved provided sufficient funds are available.

Mr. FORRESTER. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. The other projects they have indicated to you have priority over yours?

Mr. FORRESTER. No, sir; what they said was that they had seven. They said that we only have the sum of $600,000 in the budget. We just simply don't know what we can do; that we can't tell you that you will get the money in 1956.

Mr. EVINS. And the city of Montezuma will agree, you are quite sure to pay the bond costs?

Mr. FORRESTER. I know they will. Under the present administration, I know they will. Of course, if this battle is long drawn out you may get another mayor and council who may not be willing to do that.

Mr. EVINS. How often have these flash floods occurred to cause loss of damage and property and lives?

Mr. FORRESTER. The last one occurred about 6 years ago. The chairman knows that we have had severe droughts down there but right now the rainfall is pretty heavy and this may be one of the years that we are going to get it. We may get it before relief comes. But I think that we can anticipate that we are pretty soon going to have something since we had such a drought over such an extended period.

Mr. EVINS. We thank you, Mr. Forrester, for your fine statement.

Mr. MURRAY. I would like to ask one question. Has the city already authorized the issuance of these bonds?

Mr. FORRESTER. They have not but I have been down there personally and talked with the mayor and the council and I know it is purely just a matter of routine.

Mr. MURRAY. They have assured you if we appropriate——

Mr. FORRESTER. That's right. They have told me they could get this $150,000 they would immediately vote the bonds. I would like to say this also, that it is only a town of 3,500 people. That $57,000 would be pretty heavy on their budget, having to pay those bonds, but they are more than willing to do it. They would be delighted to do it if they could just get this relief.

I will tell you right now, I think that is somewhat refreshing to find that people are willing to assume some responsibility according to their means and what they could afford to pay.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Forrester.

Mr. JENSEN. Do you feel that this is a responsibility of the Federal Government?

Mr. FORRESTER. Yes, sir. The Corps of Engineers do not dispute that at all. It is caused by the navigable river, the Flint River, which has been a navigable river as long as I know, and futher south the Government has many times heretofore spent money on that river. As a matter of fact, it is attached to and becomes a part of the Appalachicola and the Chattahoochee River projects which you gentlemen have had before you for many, many years and which you would recognize by the Jim Woodruff Dam, the Buford Dam, and the Fort Gaines Dam, and so forth. It is one of the tributaries of that project.

Mr. EVINS. Thank you, Mr. Forrester.

EAGLE GORGE DAM

We will insert in the record at this point an additional statement supplied by Congressman Tollefson relative to the Eagle Gorge project.

STATEMENT OF THOR C. TOLLEFSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SIXTH DISTRICT WASHINGTON

Representatives of the city of Tacoma testified at the hearings of the Eagle Gorge project for one primary purpose, namely, to acquaint the committee with

the situation in connection with Tacoma's water supply, the intake valves for which are located a short distance downstream from the site of the proposed dam. Tacoma is seriously concerned about the effect of its water supply by the construction and operation of the dam, but did not and does not want to oppose the project which is to protect areas to the north of Tacoma. Tacoma is not in the flood area, is not affected by the floods in any way, and would not benefit by the dam except in a most remote manner. The construction and operation of the dam, on the other hand, will interfere with the city's water supply.

Under provisions of the law of the city of Tacoma and the State of Washington (Revised Code of Washington 88.010—Pollution Code Protecting City and Towns From Pollution to Water Supply. *Lawrence* v. *Southard*, 192 Washington Reports 287; 16 U. S. C. A. 524; 33 U. S. C. A. 701Q), Tacoma has definite and legal right to specific amounts of water from Green River. Pursuant to the State constitution and the State laws these rights cannot be interfered with or taken away. For any damages or injuries suffered in connection with its water supply, Tacoma could recover compensation in the courts of the land.

The Army engineers have been cognizant of the situation concerning the city's water supply from the outset of the proposed construction of the dam, and have consulted with the city representatives about it. Several steps were considered by them for the protection of Tacoma's water. One proposal was to move the intake valves upstream above the site of the dam; another was to construct pipelines to nearby lakes which would be used for reservoir purposes. Both would have proved costly to the Government. The proposal most economical to the Government was that which calls for construction of a new reservoir in connection with the present existing pipelines. Tacoma had planned to build such a new reservoir 5 to 10 years hence. Extra cost to Tacoma to build the dam now and to utilize other sources of water supply [wells] during construction of the dam would be several hundred thousand dollars. But if the city's reservoir could be built now, the Government would save many thousands of dollars after reimbursing Tacoma for its original cost. Tacoma is willing to cooperate with the Army engineers, even though some of its representatives feel that Tacoma will not in any event be fully reimbursed for its extra expenses.

It should be borne in mind that the State of Washington and King County are contributing $2 million. It is estimated that $1,250,000 of that amount will be used during the first year of construction.

LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Ackley, E. F	577
Alexander, W. A	252
Anderson, T. W	170, 330, 389
Anderson, W. W	564
Atherton, W. H	87, 309
Baldwin, Hon. J. F	318, 326
Ball, Hubert	474
Bahnfleth, E. A	102
Barline, Dean	170, 330, 389
Bartlett, Hon. E. L	230
Beasley, D. N	450
Bell, Hon. John	564
Bennett, Ben	564
Bennett, Hon. W. F	58
Boardman, W. K	230
Break, S. W	12
Brightman, F. E	170
Brooks, Hon. Jack	449, 450
Brown, Col. George	531
Bryant, John	252
Burnett, E. L	450
Caldwell, Horace	564
Carlander, C. H	170
Carlson, Thomas	318
Clarke, Jerome	154
Cohen, D. B	252
Coon, Hon. Sam	21
Coon, M. C	230
Crowell, A. M	252
Crowley, T. B	143
Daw, J. M	132
Dawson, Hon. W. A	58
Day, L. H	102, 131
De Luccia, E. R	389
Delzell, T. W	400
Dempsey, Hon. J. J	474
Deterding, C. W	102, 252
Dewey, R. B	50, 72, 318
Dickson, J. S	389
Dillon, T. V. A	123
Dixon, Hon. H. A	58
Dobbins, Sidney	542
Donoghue, R. F	72, 318
Easterling, Ed	450
Edmonston, A. D	213
Ellsworth, Hon. Harris	344
Ely, Northcutt	213, 218, 426
Engle, Hon. Clair	1, 127, 252
Erdahl, C. A	389
Ervine, Col. E. S. J	466
Falk, H. W., Jr	132
Farmer, A. D	72
Farrington, Hon. (Mrs.) J. R	248
Fentriss, Harlon	542

	Page
Finks, Harry	102
Follett, D. M	170
Forrest, T. C., Jr	439
Forrester, Hon. E. L	585
Foss, W. H	143
Galbraith, W. A	170
Gibbs, J. A	170
Gleichner, E. L	426
Goldwater, Hon. Barry	531
Green, Burt	426
Green, Hon. Edith	484
Grimes, W. B	122
Gubser, Hon. C. S	312
Hagan, Hon. Harlan	225
Hanson, H. A	170
Harris, J. C	564
Hedger, H. E	252
Hicks, Howard	450
Hiestand, Hon. E. W	25
Hill, C. A	252
Hinshaw, Hon. Carl	252
Holifield, Hon. Chet	384
Holmes, Hon. Hal	154, 419
Hopkins, F. E	337
Horan, Hon. Walt	28, 579
Jackson, Hon. D. L	384
Johnson, Hon. Leroy	87
Jones, Bob	170, 389
Jordan, Oakley	531
Kidd, Milton	252
Killian, R. R	199
King, Hon. C. R	337
Koch, Guilford	252
Kucera, Henry	439
Kultgen, Jack	542
Lanham, Hon. F. G	439
Lloyd, H. E	252
Lodi, George	102, 252
Luther, J. M	252
Mack, Hon. R. V	7, 72
Magnuson, Hon. Don	37, 154, 170, 354, 426
Mailliard, Hon. W. S	252
Mansfield, J. D	466
McCarty, R. L	213, 218
McClung, D. R	389
McDonough, Hon. G. L	359, 528
McElhaney, R. H	466
McFarland, J. W	218
McKee, P. B	389
McKinzie, W. E	564
McSwain, K. R	164
Merrill, Walter	531
Miller, Dale	439, 445, 564
Miller, Hon. G. P	19, 318, 465
Mitchell, Troy	450
Mooney, D. J	170
Morris, Ross	419
Morse, Hon. Wayne	484
Moss, Hon. J. E., Jr	102, 252
Murphy, J. P	474
Navarrete, P. A	531
Neuberger, Hon. R. L	484
Norblad, Hon. Walter	72
Norwood, Gus	512
Nowell, L. M	382
O'Conor, H. R	41
Orr, Duane	564

	Page
Page, Bradley	143
Pelly, Hon. T. M	170, 330, 358
Pfost, Hon. Gracie	356
Phillips, Hon. John	252, 382, 388
Poage, Hon. W. R	542
Potts, M. T	450
Pratt, J. C	154
Pursel, K. D	252
Recker, Earl	531
Rhodes, Hon. J. J	531
Richards, T. H., Jr	102
Roberts, W. J	564
Robertson, Hon. O. B	542
Robinson, T. R	557
Roosevelt, Hon. James	70, 359
Sablatura, J. J	564
Say, H. B	230
Scudder, Hon. H. B	114, 132, 143, 252
Shannon, W. D	170
Shelley, Hon. J. F	252, 357
Sheppard, Hon. H. R	12
Shoemaker, Leigh	132
Short, R. H	389
Sisk, Hon. B. F	162
Skousen, Jerry	531
Smith, B. F	170
Smith, Farrell	564
Stanley, C. E	252
Stemmons, J. M	439
Stevens, J. D	330
Stoddard, Howard	326
Stone, W. G	102, 115
Stretton, S. E	170
Tabor, C. C	382
Teague, Hon. C. M	85, 252
Thomas, Hon. Albert	140
Thomas, George	170
Thomson, Rex	359
Thompson, Hon. C. W	557
Tollefson, Harold	170
Tollefson, Hon. T. C	170, 589
Udall, Hon. S. L	531
Uhl, E. H	326
Underwood, H. D	382
Utt, Hon. J. B	252
Van Horn, F. N	230
Vickers, Lyle	450
Walter, H. H	154
Walters, Hubert	170
Ward, J. F	389
Warner, W. H	252
Watkins, Hon. A. V	58
Watson, Bassett	542
Wegner, A. H	389
Williams, Ray	252
Woolley, J. A	252
Wright, Hon. Jim	526
Wyman, Mrs. Rosalind	384
Young, Hon. Clifton	24, 583
Young, John	564
Zahn, G. D	154, 170

○